



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. William H. Kepler, minister, Northminster Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee that Thou hast called us to positions of leadership and service. Make us careful as we realize how great is our responsibility to our Nation and to Thee. Make us humble as we remember that the eyes of the world are upon us. Make us confident in our firm conviction that Thou art greatly concerned with the things that we do, and Thy wisdom is available to those who ask for it.

Grant now Thy blessing to the Members of this body, and at the close of this day may they know that joy which comes from the knowledge that they have given their best in the service of the Nation we love.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 2, 1951, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may transact routine business, including insertions in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY FORCES

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have been making inquiries to find out whether the North Atlantic Treaty forces commanded by General Eisen-

hower are actually receiving the weapons and equipment which they need and are supposed to receive.

It is a very great disappointment to be compelled by the fact to announce that the shipments to General Eisenhower's forces are becoming little more than a trickle when compared with what they should be.

The figures are classified as secret, but some rough idea of the shocking inadequacy of these shipments is given when I say that, in my opinion, it is a fair guess that they are currently only about one-fifth as large as they should be.

The main reason for this poor showing is that production has slipped badly in the United States of America. We ask American troops to fight for peace in Korea. We ask American troops to stand guard for peace in the tinder box of Europe. We expect the European allies to contribute manpower on the understanding that we will furnish weapons. But, apparently, we cannot demand of ourselves enough production to support our own troops and preserve our own peace. It is all part of the heavy price we pay because there are too many in high official positions who are following instead of leading.

I have reflected a long time before making this statement. It is a very disagreeable one. I finally decided to speak out because I believe that until there is some public clamor, there will never be corrective action. I suggest further that the Foreign Relations Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, immediately call the responsible officials to find out what the precise facts of the situation are and what steps can be taken to get prompt action to win the peace. I submit herewith a resolution to formalize this suggestion.

I add this word, Mr. President, that I hope the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, or a subcommittee thereof, or any individual Senator, or the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] will look into this matter to find what the trouble is, and to see whether we cannot keep faith with this North Atlantic Treaty obligation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 218), submitted by Mr. LODGE, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas it is reported that shipments of matériel from the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces are cur-

rently not as large as they should be: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation to determine the rate at which the United States is furnishing arms and military equipment to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces under the command of General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC AIRPORTS NEAR NATIONAL FORESTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain public airports in certain areas and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ANTIGENOCIDE CONVENTION—RESOLUTION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution unanimously adopted by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs of America at its board meeting held in July at the Edgewater Beach Hotel in Chicago. The resolution endorses favorable action on the Anti-Genocide Convention now pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Record at this point and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL CLUBS, INC., AT ITS BOARD MEETING HELD JULY 7 TO 12 AT THE EDGEWATER BEACH HOTEL IN CHICAGO

Whereas the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs has supported the adoption by the United Nations of a convention on the prevention and punishment of crime of genocide, and the ratification on such a convention by the United States; and

Whereas a genocide convention has been ratified by 29 countries: Be it

Resolved, That the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., urge the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate to report favorably on the Convention on the Prevention

and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and urge the Senate to ratify the Convention at the earliest possible date.

**CONTROL OF CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS FOR ELECTRIC POWER INDUSTRY—
RESOLUTION OF MIDWEST COMMITTEEMEN OF NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION**

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received a great many anxious messages from officials and members of the Rural Electric Cooperative System of Wisconsin who are deeply concerned with possible moves which might impair the careful flow of critical materials for REA purposes.

I have in my hand a resolution signed by association directors for Wisconsin, Illinois, and Iowa on this matter.

It represents the unanimous views of the delegated representatives who met in regional conference in Chicago on September 27, and who appealed for maintenance of the present system of allocation of materials through the Defense Electric Power Administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the present controls and allocations of critical materials used in the construction of electric generation and transmission facilities are operating in a fair and equitable manner for the whole utility industry; and

Whereas any move to disturb the present controls and allocations setup would seriously retard the construction program and would without question work to the very great detriment of the construction program of the rural electric systems, including both the production and distribution of power for essential farm operations; and

Whereas we are reliably informed that a move is afoot to abolish the present controls and allocations program as administered by Defense Electric Power Administration and other agencies and to transfer these functions to the Defense Production Authority; and

Whereas it is believed that certain officials in Defense Production Authority do not look approvingly upon the rural-electrification-construction program and particularly upon the efforts of the farmers to generate some of their own power: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, we, the delegated representatives of the more than 100 rural electric systems of Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin assembled in regional meeting at Chicago this 27th day of September 1951, appeal to Defense Mobilizer Charles Wilson to continue the present methods of control on construction materials for the electric-power industry and not to transfer the functions of DEPA and other agencies to DPA, that we appeal to the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to insist upon the controls remaining as they are, that we appeal to the President to demand that the controls remain as they are, and that we appeal to our Congressmen and Senators to insist that the status quo in controls and allocations of materials used in the electric industry be maintained.

INCREASED LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 219), which was

referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-second Congress, \$10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946, and Senate Resolution 171, agreed to August 6, 1951.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 2205. A bill for the relief of Sonia Sookhdeo Wall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2206. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ercole Barattucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2207. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in recognition of the outstanding services of Cordell Hull to this Nation and to the cause of international cooperation and understanding; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2208. A bill to provide an extension of time within which educational and vocational rehabilitation benefits may be furnished to certain veterans of World War II who later served in the military or naval service before July 25, 1951; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2209. A bill to provide for the construction of a circumferential highway in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2210. A bill for the relief of Richard A. Seidenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2211 (by request). A bill to amend section 221 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to clarify certain requirements relating to the designation of persons upon whom process may be served; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NIXON:

S. 2212. A bill for the relief of Charles Michell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 2213. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. HILL, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. TAFT):

S. 2214. A bill to amend section 709 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. SCHOEPEL, and Mr. DIRKSEN) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2170) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EMERGENCY PROFESSIONAL HEALTH TRAINING ACT OF 1951—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina submitted amendments intended to be pro-

posed by him to the bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946, to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 337, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF MANUSCRIPT ENTITLED "QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT" (S. DOC. NO. 74)

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers on Equal Rights Amendment" prepared by the Research Department of the National Woman's Party.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GEORGE W. FOLTA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DIVISION NO. 1, DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, October 10, 1951, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. George W. Folta, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 1, District of Alaska. Judge Folta is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired April 30, 1951. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]; and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Address on the Japanese Peace Treaty, delivered by Hon. John Foster Dulles at the Governors' conference at Gatlinburg, Tenn., on October 1, 1951.

By Mr. ELLENDER (on behalf of himself and Mr. PASTORE):

Editorial entitled "Senator GREEN: 84," published in the Washington Post of October 3, 1951, paying tribute to Senator GREEN on the eighty-fourth anniversary of his birth.

By Mr. HILL:

Address delivered on September 21, 1951, by Hon. Wayne Coy, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, at one hundredth anniversary celebration of the first train order by telegraph, at Harriman, N. Y.

By Mr. LANGER:

Address at dedication of Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak., delivered by Mr. Richard D. Searles, Under Secretary, Department of the Interior, September 29, 1951.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Article entitled "Doctors," written by Dr. Alan Gregg, of the Rockefeller Foundation, and published in the Scientific American for September 1951, regarding America's need for doctors, and a statement by Senator DOUGLAS regarding the article.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Article entitled "Suspicion of News Tinkering Overcasts Edict on Secrecy," written by James Reston and published in the New York Times of October 3, 1951.

Article entitled "New Type of Censorship," written by Roscoe Drummond, chief, Washington news bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, published in that newspaper under date of September 27, 1951, and an editorial entitled "Step Toward Tyranny," published in the same newspaper on the same date.

EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK—PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a proclamation of Hon. Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, designating the period October 7 to 13, 1951, as employ-the-physically-handicapped week in the State of New York.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The latest figures of the New York State Employment Service show that there is a shortage of labor in many fields of our State industry essential to the national defense effort. The shortage grows more serious from week to week.

It is, accordingly, all the more important to call attention to a considerable pool of workers available for employment in many factories of different kinds—those who are physically handicapped.

There are many jobs which these people can do quite as efficiently and quickly as those who are uninjured. Many employers have discovered that the physically handicapped are frequently better because they are more cautious and more responsible. They take better care of themselves and of the machines they are called upon to operate. Moreover, there is less absenteeism among the physically handicapped and more punctuality.

It is a fine human act as well as one greatly in the national interest to employ the physically handicapped.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the period of October 7-13, 1951, as employ-the-physically-handicapped week in New York State, and I ask all employers, large and small, within the State, to hire more physically handicapped people, and hire them now.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 21st day of September in the year of our Lord 1951.

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

By the Governor:

JAMES C. HAGERTY,
Secretary to the Governor.

LETTER FROM ERLE COCKE, JR., NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated September

25, 1951, which I have received from Erle Cocke, Jr., national commander of the American Legion. The letter explains in some detail the views of the American Legion on the bill to increase disability benefits for certain veterans, and why it approves of the enactment of the measure the veto of the President notwithstanding. I believe Mr. Cocke's letter sets forth interesting and persuasive arguments for the measure.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Indianapolis, Ind., September 25, 1951.
Hon. ERNEST W. McFARLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McFARLAND: This is a letter of congratulations and of thanks.

It is intended to convey to you some sense of the appreciation on the part of the 3,000,000 Legionnaires of the important role you played in the enactment over the President's veto of H. R. 3193, now Public Law 149.

We believe that you acted not only in the veterans' interest but in the national interest. We are convinced that a very great majority of the American people join us in applauding this action.

For some time now, we have noted in the press a strangely belligerent and resentful reaction to anything having to do with maintenance and improvement of veterans' benefits. The attitude is one of impatience bordering on disdain. It is reflected in editorials and articles which all too often emphasize astronomical cost projections rather than basic facts.

Because passage of H. R. 3193 was greeted in this fashion in many areas, I want to place on your record a brief review of the matter.

The American Legion advocated a reasonable pension for helpless and bedridden war veterans long before the introduction into Congress of the measure which last week became law. Three successive national conventions—in 1948, 1949, and 1950—reiterated the plea. We studied the question, we debated it, and we concluded that it was morally right and economically necessary.

The most severe objective scrutiny will disclose the new law to be just that.

The \$120 monthly benefit is reserved exclusively for those veterans who are in fact unemployable—who are blind, helpless, or otherwise so disabled as to require the full-time attendance of another person. In addition, the beneficiary cannot have more than \$1,000 income if single or \$2,500 if with dependents.

This law will add not a single penny to the tax burden of the American people. I cite this fact merely to refute the outlandish implications of cost that have been used against it. Every veteran who qualifies for the benefit will have already exhausted the last possibility of self-support. The only question, then, is how needed public assistance shall be provided: Whether through county or State taxes or through Federal taxes. It is obviously fair in the case of those who have served all of the people to distribute responsibility for their care among all of the people.

The burden, therefore, rests squarely upon the Federal Government. Public Law 149 recognizes this obligation.

Pension based upon identical principles has been awarded by the Congress to veterans of the War Between the States, the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion. A policy precedent thus has been four times affirmed by different sessions of the Congress in different periods of our history. Fifty-five years

elapsed between the end of the War Between the States and provision of this type of benefit for veterans of that conflict. The Eighty-second Congress, by acting now, has assured that the intended beneficiaries of the World Wars and of Korea will have full opportunity to claim their right.

The President in his veto message complained that the measure would grant a special award to veterans "whose disabilities are in no way connected with military service." The complaint is as ill-founded as it is misdirected. Advisers to the President are in a position to know better.

The veterans who will receive the new payment are in large part those who have been and are drawing part III pensions for permanent and total disability. The latest Veterans' Administration hospital census conducted by the VA showed that of 19,632 patients in the general, medical and surgery (nonservice connected) category, 5,532 were receiving part III pensions, and 6,554 had disabilities connected with their war service. Who can say that the service disability did not play a big part in bringing about the conditions that made these men permanently and totally disabled on a non-service-connected rating? To assume the contrary is crass speculation.

According to the same VA census, 1,808 patients among the 19,632 rated as nonservice connected were then awaiting the outcome of claims filed for the purpose of establishing service connection. As you can well realize, the margin of human error in the process of adjudicating such claims is great. How much greater the error to imply a prejudgment against the claimant.

As of July 31, there were 312,000 veterans drawing pensions for permanent and total disabilities rated as nonservice connected. This included 30,406 World War II veterans. Less than 8 percent—or only 8 out of 100—of the total group are expected to qualify for benefits under the new law.

Were they all bedridden and therefore eligible for this new pension, the obligation upon the Government would be just as binding.

The American Legion is concerned about the high cost of government. But the American Legion is equally concerned about the high responsibility of government, and we condemn and deplore the double-standard viewpoint of those who would make cost the all-important index of the merit of veterans' legislation while assigning it only moderate importance in other sectors.

Of all the legislative proposals which come before you, those affecting veterans are the only ones which are consistently presented to the reading public on the basis of cost in the year 2000. Most Americans knew the projected cost of the pension bill by the end of the century before they knew the nature of the bill itself. And the basis of the projection in this instance as in many others remains a highly mysterious question.

The Congress within the week has approved a salary increase for government workers. We are in sympathy with your action. But so far as we can determine, no voice has been raised to point out that the consequent cost to the taxpayers will be some \$25,000,000,000 by the end of the century.

Certain elements of the population long have regarded veterans' benefits as the soft underbelly of government spending. Organizations have been formed under varied and attractive aliases for the sole purpose of dulling the public sense of responsibility as regards veterans' rehabilitation. We sometimes wonder if individuals who lead such groups consult either their conscience or the realities of human suffering.

Public Law 149 is a good law. It is a law to be proud of. And it is to the lasting credit of Members of the United States Congress—a mark of your moral and political

courage—that you resisted the pressures put upon you to forget these needy veterans.

Sincerely,

ERLE COCKE, Jr.,
National Commander.

**EMERGENCY PROFESSIONAL HEALTH
TRAINING ACT OF 1951**

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946, to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has before it Senate bill 337, to which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has reported a complete substitute.

Mr. PASTORE obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the pending bill is S. 337—a bill designed to provide critically needed financial assistance to those schools on which this Nation depends to train the doctors and nurses so badly needed both by our Armed Forces and by the civilian population of this Nation.

Before discussing the bill in detail, Mr. President, I should like to make four flat statements of fact. I should like to state, first, that this is emergency legislation designed to meet a real and critical emergency situation. Secondly, the objectives sought by this proposed legislation are directly related both to the immediate needs of our Armed Forces and to our civilian defense program. Third, that while this measure calls for an outlay of many millions of dollars—367,000,000 in 5 years, to be a little more exact—this is nonetheless an economy measure. The money involved would represent an investment in the future health of this Nation. Finally, I should like to state that S. 337 is one of the most carefully considered and most soundly drawn measures before the Senate.

These statements, Mr. President, are, I think, thoroughly justified and amply explained in the report which accompanies this bill. That they are justified is also apparent, I believe, to anyone who realizes that this bill is sponsored by the entire membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Our committee is comprised in part of men who serve also on the Foreign

Relations or the Armed Services Committee, and can be expected to know our emergency needs and to know just which measures are related to defense. These men are cosponsors of this bill. On our committee are also some of the Senate's most sincere and outspoken advocates of Federal economy. These men, too, are cosponsors of S. 337. Finally, our committee contains men whose records as legislators are such as to guarantee that their names would never appear on a bill unless it were soundly drawn. They, too, are cosponsors of S. 337. In short, Mr. President, our committee, whose members represent every section of the country, as well as both political parties, and which is fully aware of its grave responsibilities in this time of crisis, is unanimous in reporting to the Senate its belief that this bill should receive prompt and favorable action.

Mr. President, I should like to talk about the need for such a measure as the one now before the Senate because I agree wholeheartedly with the junior Senator from Illinois when he insists that this Congress should not be concerned itself with legislation, particularly not with legislation involving the expenditure of large sums of money, unless there are immediate, real, and compelling reasons to do so.

This bill would provide grants to help our medical, dental, osteopathic, and nursing schools meet their costs of instruction; it would provide funds to aid these schools in expanding their enrollment and their output; it would provide funds for a pilot program of plant expansion, and would provide scholarships in those fields where we do not now have sufficient students.

This bill arose out of four pressing needs: First, the need for additional funds if these schools are to barely maintain their current output of doctors and nurses; second, the Nation's need for a great many more physicians and nurses than our schools are turning out; third, the need for a great increase in the financial support extended these schools if they are to even think of expanding their enrollment; and, finally, a most pressing need to bring about an increase in the number of young women training to be nurses.

As regards the first of these, I should like to point out that all too few people are aware of the fact that the institutions which produced our skilled physicians, dentists, nurses, and public health officers are faced with financial problems so critical and so acute that few can continue even their present programs for long without prompt and large-scale financial aid. We cannot expand these schools until we have taken steps to keep them in existence. Already no fewer than 33 of our country's medical schools have had to eliminate departments, reduce their faculties, and drop essential courses from the curriculum. A most thorough and authoritative study made public within the last several months shows that our medical schools alone need an additional \$40,000,000 a year in current operating funds merely to perform their existing functions adequately. We simply cannot ask our medical schools to expand their enroll-

ment until we first help guarantee their continued existence. S. 337 would do this by granting to each of these schools a sum approximately equal to one-twelfth of the cost of instructing each of its students.

At this juncture, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate, particularly the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia and the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma, that the committee is perfectly agreeable to shifting some of the emphasis originally placed upon maintenance of existing enrollments over to the aspects of expansion. It was in this spirit of compromise that the committee revised the grants for current enrollments from \$500 to \$200 in the case of medical schools and made corresponding reductions in the case of other schools under this bill, at the same time raising the grants insofar as they affect the expansion features of this bill.

At this point, for the convenience of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the table of grants, both as to the basic amount and as to the additional incentive amount, under the bill as reported by the committee, and as shown on page 13 of the committee report, be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

School	Annual Federal grant per student	
	Basic amount	Additional incentive amount
Medicine, osteopathy.....	\$500	\$500
Dentistry.....	400	400
Dental hygiene.....	150	150
Nursing:		
Degree school (basic training).....	200	200
Degree school (advanced training).....	400	400
Diploma school.....	150	100
Practical nursing.....	100	50
Public health.....	1,000	1,000

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, does the Senator from Rhode Island desire to finish his statement first, or will he yield for a question?

Mr. PASTORE. I think it would be much more convenient and would add to the clarity of the subject if I finished my statement first.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Very well.

Mr. PASTORE. At this point I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the basic amounts and additional incentive amounts as agreed to by the committee and as covered in an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On page 32, line 6, strike out "\$500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200."

On page 32, line 8, strike out "\$500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,000."

On page 32, line 12, strike out "\$400" and insert in lieu thereof "\$160."

On page 32, line 14, strike out "\$400" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,600."

On page 32, line 18, strike out "\$150" and insert in lieu thereof "\$60."

On page 32, line 20, strike out "\$150" and insert in lieu thereof "\$600."

On page 32, line 25, strike out "\$200" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100."

On page 33, line 2, strike out "\$200" and insert in lieu thereof "\$300."

On page 33, line 6, strike out "\$400" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200."

On page 33, line 8, strike out "\$400" and insert in lieu thereof "\$600."

On page 33, line 11, strike out "\$150" and insert in lieu thereof "\$65."

On page 33, line 13, strike out "\$100" and insert in lieu thereof "\$185."

On page 33, line 20, strike out "\$100" and insert in lieu thereof "\$35."

On page 33, line 22, strike out "\$50" and insert in lieu thereof "\$115."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, turning now to our second great need—that for a vastly increased number of doctors and nurses—I think I can be quite brief. I do not believe that there is a single man on the floor of the Senate who does not agree that even before the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, whole areas of this country were sadly deficient in the number of doctors and nurses needed to render adequate care to our people. Since the outbreak of the war in Korea, thousands of doctors and nurses have been called to serve in our Armed Forces, and the Armed Forces have announced that at the end of this current fiscal year they will need more than 11,000 more physicians to service our 3,500,000-man Army. Obviously, the withdrawal of 11,000 physicians from civilian life will mean that millions of people will lose their doctors and will have to seek service from other doctors already overburdened by their current patient load. Consider, too, the fact that the last report from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs points out that there are enough wards in veterans' hospitals now closed because of inability to recruit medical personnel to make a total equal to 16 average hospitals.

Mr. President, just think of this when you hear talk of economy. Sixteen hospitals, costing millions of dollars, fully built, completely equipped, waiting to go—thousands of patients waiting to enter those hospitals—patients who, if they were restored to health, would once again become wealth-producing, tax-paying members of our society. Yet these 16 hospitals stand empty because they cannot get the necessary medical personnel—because we "economized" on our medical schools.

The same situation, of course, is true as regards many of our privately operated hospitals. Dr. Rusk, chairman of the Health Resources Advisory Committee, has told us that we have got to increase our current output of doctors by some 22,000 by 1954 if we are to meet our Nation's need for additional health personnel. No, I am sure I need not dwell on this point any further. Let me turn instead to the implications of this situation for our schools of medicine, dentistry, and public health.

We are, of course, asking these schools to increase their facilities, expand their faculties, and take in as many additional students as they can properly train. Their acquiescence in our request would be a recognition on their part of the national emergency created by short-

ages in the health professions. Yet, we cannot simply ask the schools to undertake a program of expansion when we know that for each additional student a school of medicine would take in, it would be assuming an added deficit of more than \$1,500.

The average cost to the school, of training a medical student for 1 year is over \$2,400. The student pays an average tuition fee of \$600. Obviously, with medical schools already going bankrupt, they cannot under these circumstances expand without financial assistance. This bill, S. 337, would offer assistance to the schools in solving that problem. In this connection I would point out to those who have expressed some concern over the quality of training which might be given in an expansion program, that our committee has set up protections against any lowering of standards by not only limiting the total grants for costs of instruction to not to exceed 50 percent of those costs, but we have also stipulated that we will limit the incentive grants made to encourage increased enrollments to not more than 30 percent of the school's average past enrollment. In other words, because a few individuals have suggested that an occasional school might be tempted to overexpand its capacity because of these incentive payments, we have said that if a school had had an enrollment of 100 students in its freshman class during these last few years, we would make incentive payments, but for not more than 30 additional students. I would also point out that no school would be eligible for these grants unless it were accredited, and I am quite sure that we can rely upon the accrediting body of the American Medical Association to refuse to recognize any school which failed to meet its standards.

In the course of these last few remarks, I have explained two methods under which our bill would extend financial assistance: First, through grants to meet part of costs of instruction under present enrollments; and, second, through incentive grants to help meet the increased costs of additional enrollments.

Senate bill 337 would also aid in two other ways: First, by making available not to exceed \$10,000,000 a year for construction of new, or expansion or existing training facilities. Since this \$10,000,000 would be spread over the five categories of schools covered by the bill, whereas, our medical schools alone could use over \$150,000,000 for construction, I think it will be obvious to all that the sum recommended by your committee is a very minor sum, indeed. Our major reason for so drastically limiting construction funds is that we recognize the complexity of the problems involved and, consequently, the desirability of moving forward on this front very slowly—certainly until the National Council on Education in the Health Professions, which is created by the bill, conducts surveys, analyzes the situation, and recommends to the Congress a detailed plan for solving the problem of providing adequate facilities in this field. Under the terms of the bill, the Council must report to the Congress within 2 years.

Finally, the bill would provide for a system of scholarships to be distributed

as widely as possible among the States, and to be given only to students who evinced both outstanding ability and economic need, and whose applications had been accepted by accredited schools. Our bill restricts those scholarships to fields in which there are not enough applicants to fill the schools to capacity. Obviously, this is not the case as regards schools of medicine and dentistry. They now have many more applicants than they have room for. Unless this situation were to change radically, and we do not expect it to, the scholarships provided under our bill would go to persons undertaking training in nursing, practical nursing, and perhaps graduate work in public health.

I say to you, Mr. President, that we are confronted with a grave emergency in the field of medical education. We must act promptly in order to save our medical, dental, and nursing schools. If we are not content with merely saving those schools, but also recognize our responsibility for meeting the emergency needs of this Nation for a greatly increased number of doctors and nurses, we must do more. We must enable those schools to expand their capacity on a sound and long-range basis. Therefore, your committee has prepared and now recommends to the Senate this emergency measure, the duration of which is limited to not to exceed 5 years, save in the case of practical nursing, and the operation of which is to be reviewed by a National Advisory Council which will report its findings to the Congress within 2 years after the act becomes law.

I have said that the need for the sort of action recommended in this bill is urgent; yet, despite that fact, your committee has taken great pains to see to it that whatever action is taken under the terms of this bill cannot in any way impair the freedom of the schools or their identification with their own local communities. On the latter point we have insisted that schools receiving aid must make every effort to maintain their existing sources of revenue. In addition, we have provided that Federal aid in no case shall total more than 50 percent of the school's costs. On the first point, we have not only stated our intention to maintain the traditional freedom of our medical schools in the bill's statement of policy, but we have written into the bill itself specific guaranties that the independence and freedom of our schools will be preserved inviolate. That we have succeeded in these endeavors is, I believe, made manifest by the fact that the bill has received the wholehearted endorsement not only of labor, farm, and other lay groups, but of such guardians of the freedom of our schools from Federal domination as the American Dental Association, the Association of Deans of American Medical Schools, more than 60 individual deans of medical and dental schools, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Legion.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to read from the report of your committee with respect to the bill, as follows:

To summarize the need for action, we would note that even before the outbreak of Soviet-inspired hostilities in the Far East the Senate's Committee on Labor and Public

Welfare, on the basis of its own independent and thorough study of this situation, had come to the unanimous conclusion that legislation along the lines of S. 337 was necessary even if our only concern was to maintain the number and the quality of individuals being trained in the health professions. Subsequently, the President of the United States, having pointed out that "this Eighty-second Congress faces as grave a task as any Congress in the history of our Republic," told us that, in his opinion, one of the 10 subjects on which legislation was imperatively needed to further the Nation's mobilization job concerned "means for increasing the supply of doctors, nurses, and other trained medical personnel critically needed for the defense effort."

Now, having again reviewed the situation, your committee, whose members represent every section of the country, as well as both political parties, and which is fully aware of its grave responsibilities, is unanimous in reporting its belief that, in view of the current situation and in consequence of the intensified manpower problem in the health professions and of the increased costs of training, prompt and favorable action on this measure is essential.

SUPPRESSION OF NEWS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, last week at the time of the issuance of the OPS regulation to suppress news which might be embarrassing to that agency, I spoke on the subject of the Executive, Government-wide order on the classification of information which has the effect of suppressing the news.

In this morning's New York Times, I have noticed an article by James Reston. The article is headlined "Suspicion of news tinkering overcasts edict on secrecy—Approach of the administration to public information likened to a press agent's."

Mr. President, in the article the reporter has taken pains to point out seven specific instances of what is called suppression of the news. I read from the article:

Therefore, at Ottawa—

He was referring to suppression of the news at the recent conference at Ottawa—

a strict security policy was invoked. The following week, however, Premier Alcide de Gasperi of Italy came to Washington, and the Government wanted publicity. So the big information machine was put to work. Background press conferences were held all over the place; communiqués, speeches, statements of approval were issued galore. Officials who wouldn't look at a reporter in Ottawa were suddenly amiable and even loquacious on those aspects of the visit they thought would impress opinion in Italy.

MATTER OF NEWS VALUES

Just why this visit was more newsworthy than the visit of the Canadian Prime Minister Louis S. St. Laurent a few days later was not clear, but in the De Gasperi case the administration decided to make news while on the other visit—during which Mr. St. Laurent made the decidedly newsworthy suggestion that Canada build the St. Lawrence seaway herself if necessary—the administration gave him short shift and even sent Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan to the airport to meet him.

In short, there is a widespread suspicion here that the administration tinkers with the news over and above the requirements of security, and partly as a result of the rearmament program, partly in response to Congress' emphasis on security regulations—

That is the only part of this particular article which I do not seem to be able to substantiate. I know of nothing in any congressional act nor do I know of any congressional intent to suppress legitimate news to which the people are entitled. And certainly I know of nothing to suggest that Congress had ever instructed the administration to propagandize any event or incident such as is related in this article—

is now more security-minded than anybody except the Russians.

Of course, the Senator from Michigan has always felt that the question of security should be paramount, but only questions of real security. Continuing with the article, which is very significant, I read:

At Ottawa, the United States Embassy was protected by the marines, who went to elaborate security checks before allowing reporters to enter the building, even in the company of high United States officials. At the Japanese Peace Treaty Conference in San Francisco, the State Department placed steel-helmeted soldiers of the Sixth Army on the stage until the Australians pointed out that, after all, this was a peace conference.

Thus, the new administration security-information order has received the raised-eyebrows treatment, because, regardless of its intent, it must be implemented by many men who have been playing heroes and villains with the news over the last few years.

Mr. President, I think there has been no more important regulation ever made by this Government affecting the people of the United States and their liberties, and the very foundation of this Republic, than the recent order of the President. I am glad that the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] spoke yesterday upon this important matter. The Senator from Michigan had joined with him in sponsoring a bill to set aside this order. Mr. President, I ask that the entire article be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUSPICION OF NEWS TINKERING OVERCASTS EDICT ON SECRECY—APPROACH OF THE ADMINISTRATION TO PUBLIC INFORMATION LIKENED TO A PRESS AGENT'S

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 2.—Several events of the last few weeks indicate why the press and radio have been slightly skeptical of President Truman's recent order authorizing Federal civilian agencies to withhold information from the public for security reasons.

Among these events were the following:

1. At the recent meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Ottawa Secretary of State Dean Acheson not only opposed publication of limited and officially edited summaries of the general debate on the world situation, as proposed by public-relations officers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, but also opposed publication of the agenda of the meeting. Incidentally, the official agenda had already been published when he opposed publication of it.

2. The State Department placed a "restricted" stamp on a catalog of the names and hotel addresses of the delegates at the recent Japanese Peace Treaty Conference in San Francisco. This prevented reporters from getting the list until other delegations, objecting to the ruling, made the list public.

3. The White House recently blocked publication of a report by one of its own top

officials because the report was critical of some aspects of the administration's rearmament effort, and presumably because it coincided with the dismissal of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

4. The Treasury Department recently held back news of irregularity in the Internal Revenue Bureau in St. Louis until compelled to acknowledge the problem by disclosure on Capitol Hill.

5. After many weeks of negotiation with the NATO countries on sharing the cost of certain bases in Europe an agreement was signed at Ottawa last month. Not even the principles of this agreement or the percentages of the cost have been made public.

6. State and Defense Departments repeatedly denied reports of differences with General MacArthur over the conduct of policy in the Far East, though these eventually led to a dismissal for which the public was entirely unprepared.

7. The Department of Defense sat on the recent disclosures of the death of two officers of the Office of Strategic Services in the famous Holohan case until forced to release the information by an article in True magazine.

These are all run-of-the-mine cases. They do not compare with the administration's secret deal to bring the Ukraine and Byelo-Russia into the United Nations. Nor do they raise security questions, as did the Kuriles-South Sakhalin-China Railroad deal, which was designed to bring the Soviet Union into the war with Japan.

SUPPRESSIONS OF CONVENIENCE

Most of them were suppressions of convenience, designed to ease the process of negotiation, as in the cost-of-bases deal, or to save the administration embarrassment, as in Nos. 3, 4, 6, and 7 above.

President Truman's new order on handling security information was not intended to protect or encourage suppressions of convenience. On the contrary, it specifically condemned such suppression.

Nevertheless, the order created some apprehension here because the administration's approach to public information is very much like a press agent's approach.

That is to say, the administration's tendency is to turn the flow of information on or off in accordance with the tactic of the moment, flooding the wires with news when it wants to put something over, and closing down on information if disclosure might prove embarrassing.

There were some security angles to the Ottawa conference that had to be handled carefully—although it is doubtful if any NATO military scheme can be put into effect in Europe without the Communists, who are part of almost every continental army, knowing all about it—but in the main that conference dealt with several basic criticisms of United States policy, which our officials did not particularly want publicized.

Therefore, at Ottawa, a strict security policy was invoked. The following week, however, Premier Alcide de Gasperi, of Italy, came to Washington, and the Government wanted publicity. So the big information machine was put to work. Background press conferences were held all over the place; communiqués, speeches, statements of approval were issued galore. Officials who wouldn't look at a reporter in Ottawa were suddenly amiable and even loquacious on those aspects of the visit they thought would impress opinion in Italy.

MATTER OF NEWS VALUE

Just why this visit was more newsworthy than the visit of the Canadian Prime Minister Louis S. St. Laurent a few days later was not clear, but in the De Gasperi case the administration decided to make news while on the other visit—during which Mr. St. Laurent made the decidedly newsworthy suggestion that Canada build the St. Law-

rence seaway herself if necessary—the administration gave him short shrift and even sent Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan to the airport to meet him.

In short, there is a widespread suspicion here that the administration tinkers with the news over and above the requirements of security, and partly as a result of the rearmament program, partly in response to Congress' emphasis on security regulations, is now more security-minded than anybody except the Russians.

At Ottawa, the United States Embassy was protected by the marines, who went to elaborate security checks before allowing reporters to enter the building, even in the company of high United States officials. At the Japanese Peace Treaty Conference in San Francisco, the State Department placed steel-helmeted soldiers of the Sixth Army on the stage until the Australians pointed out that, after all, this was a peace conference.

Thus, the new administration security-information order has received the raised-eyebrows treatment, because, regardless of its intent, it must be implemented by many men who have been playing heroes and villains with the news over last few years.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, before I talk about Senate bill 337, the emergency professional health training bill, I should like to take the time of the Senate for a few minutes on the subject just discussed by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] who read to the Senate at some length from an article written by the distinguished journalist, Mr. Reston, in this morning's New York Times. Mr. Reston's story deals with the recent NATO conference at Ottawa, and cites seven case illustrations of information withheld from the public by Government officials or agencies.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the close of my remarks, an editorial from last Friday's New York Times, entitled "Classifying Information."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENTON. The order, to which Senator FERGUSON referred and which is discussed in this editorial is the President's recent order, which has been so very widely discussed, establishing a uniform system in the Federal Government for safeguarding information considered vital to the national security, information which, in the judgment of Federal officials, should be kept out of unfriendly or enemy hands.

The President's executive order for the protection of defense secrets, however, is only one side of the problem, as the article by Mr. Reston helps point up. The other side of the issue which may be equally or even more important, is the problem of making available to the American people the information they need if they are to make intelligent decisions.

The presumption, Mr. President, should always be on the side of full and prompt public disclosure of all information. Most unhappily that is not always the presumption in practice. Most unhappily, it is all too seldom the presumption in practice, as is disclosed in Mr. Reston's penetrating article.

However, I do not see how anyone can properly quarrel with the principle laid

down by the President that the security rules should be uniform in all Government departments. This was the prime purpose of the President's order, and it is a most legitimate purpose. The purpose should not be abandoned, and the order should not be rescinded unless it is to be reissued in some other form.

Not so long ago security secrets were primarily the province of the State Department, the War Department, the Navy Department, and the FBI. Today a great many agencies all over Washington are involved, and all of them should be able to exchange information on the basis of uniform protection and according to a uniform system.

However, in my judgment the President's order designed to develop a uniform system should have been further elaborated so as to include some greatly needed new steps designed to help get information out to the press and the public. The order should now be strengthened, and it should now be greatly strengthened, in my judgment, in the public interest, looking toward more disclosure of more information, and more rapid disclosure.

I had more than 2 years of daily experience, Mr. President, with this problem while I was in the State Department. A part of my job was to help get information through to the public. As an Assistant Secretary I was entitled to see the daily "Top secret summary." I remember how astonished I was in my early weeks in the Department to discover that much of what I read in this top secret summary I had already read in the newspapers, in the news dispatches from abroad, and I may say, far better written and often much more complete than the State Department versions. I was astonished because I had not then learned, Mr. President, the great importance, from the standpoint of the State Department, of protecting their sources of information; and the way this need often forces the classification of seemingly innocent material.

I remember that I was even more astonished to see newspaper clippings coming in from abroad labeled "Restricted"—on the theory that we in the State Department did not even want any foreign agent to know what we were interested in. This seemed absurd to me then as it does now. One result of this system was that, at the end of a day of reading floods of dispatches and memoranda, even a man with a brilliant memory—much more brilliant than I claim to have—could not remember the exact classification of every item of information or where or under what circumstances he had read it. His best course was to keep silent about everything.

Mr. President, that is only one facet of the problem. Another facet is the tendency of people in the sensitive agencies to think that the particular projects they are working on are the most vital in the Government. This naturally makes them tend to overclassify their material. Some of them deliberately overclassify in order to dramatize to their superiors the importance of what they are doing. Others overclassify through fear of going wrong if they do not.

Even more deadening, however, in keeping information from the public, is the fact that the agencies have never had people in top key spots whose job it is to create a presumption in favor of immediate, full disclosure. There is no reward, and often some risk, in recommending disclosure. This is the inducement to the second flight administrators to play it close to the chest. There is no one to make the argument for disclosure, and the decision goes by default. Once a document is classified, then all related documents usually have to bear the same classification; and the system closes down.

Within a few weeks after I entered the State Department I asked for a thorough study of this problem. I had decided that the news correspondence had a most legitimate complaint. At any insistence, the Department set up a committee to study the subject of simplifying and improving our classification system. The committee came up with a minor recommendation that was helpful but not nearly adequate. This recommendation was that the classification "top secret" could be used only with the personal approval of an Ambassador, or an Assistant Secretary or higher official; and that the classification "secret" could be used only with the personal approval of an office director or higher. As the matter had stood previously, anyone could attach any label he chose to any subject matter he originated.

My major recommendation was not adopted. That was that a team of five men—enough to cover the entire department—under the leadership of an outstanding man drawn from the newspaper field—should be appointed as Department officers with the job of making the argument in every case for full disclosure, forcing clarification of the reasons for nondisclosure, and with the right of appeal to the Secretary.

This was one of the many fights I lost in the State Department. This highly important fight, I hope, is still going on.

Two years ago, shortly before I entered the Senate, I resurveyed this question, as a member of the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development, and as a member of its subcommittee which prepared its report on National Security and Our Individual Freedom. The CED Committee, under the distinguished chairmanship of Mr. Fred Lazarus, of Cincinnati, worked out a formula not dissimilar to my proposals in the State Department, but at an even higher level and on a Government-wide basis. This proposal, as incorporated in the CED report, called for the appointment of an additional civilian member of the National Security Council whose function would be continuously to advance the presumption of the public right to information; to review the procedures regularly; to argue the case for disclosure instance by instance on important matters; to force a clear statement of the reasons for secrecy; to review the cases of withheld information regularly in order to determine if the need for secrecy had passed; with the right of appeal to the full Security Council in disputed cases.

The actual text of this section of the report follows:

The assignment of one of the proposed full-time members of the National Security Council to be responsible for a more effective flow of information to the public would tend to counteract the present trend toward undue secrecy. This official should study all security regulations and recommend to the President changes designed to provide all possible access to information without sacrifice of basic security. He should examine the practical administration of security regulations with a view to creating an atmosphere favorable to legitimate disclosure. And he should constantly press for the release of information.

There is no more essential job to be done in America than to keep the sources of public opinion as free as possible from blocks and obstacles. The naming of a full-time member of the National Security Council to devote himself to this task would be a fitting recognition of its importance.

It will be necessary to keep security regulations under continual study to make sure that the curtain of secrecy is not drawn tighter than necessary. Some information must be withheld. But we believe that the regulations could be so drawn as to provide the citizen with much more information than he now receives.

More important than the letter of a regulation is the spirit in which it is administered. At present, there is one-sided emphasis upon the importance of secrecy in the indoctrination of officers, both military and nonmilitary. A Government official is rarely commended for disclosure. He may, however, be reprimanded or otherwise disciplined for underclassification, that is, for failure to make material confidential or secret. Accumulations of overclassified material can be found in many offices. A better balance between secrecy and disclosure will give the citizen a sounder basis for exercising responsibility, without impairing the administration of security. Among the administrative practices to which attention needs to be paid is the custom of leaving classification in the hands of subordinates, especially clerks or secretaries. The resulting resistance to disclosure can be overcome only if there is positive pressure to release information.

Mr. President, the American people need today a top-ranking advocate of the people's right to know. He should have a counterpart in the various key Government departments fighting as hard to release information as some officials have been known to fight to suppress it. Such men, with real power, could in my judgment, do even more than correct the present condition which worries so many members of the press and which has been brought to the fore by the President's recent order; they could help provide the people with more information than they have ever had before about the key issues which can mean life or death for millions.

Two final and specific points: The system proposed in the President's directive involves four classes of secret information—top secret, secret, confidential, and restricted. That is the system which was used in the State Department in my day. It is still the system. Far from simplifying it, it is now being expanded to all departments. This calls for at least one classification too many. "Secret," according to the directive, "requires extraordinary protection." Confidential "requires careful protection." Restricted "requires protection." Does

restricted material require protection that is less than careful? In my experience the category of "restricted" got handling that was actually careless, and furthermore invited sloppy decisions in marginal cases as to whether information should or should not be withheld. I would urge upon the President and his advisers the elimination of the so-called restricted category. Before expanding this system to all departments, I suggest the need, first, to make this important improvement.

In issuing his Executive order the President has expressed the hope that the policies he has set forth will mean that the American people will receive more, rather than less, information about their Government. All of us can share that hope. But whether that hope will be realized will depend, of course, on how the policies are administered.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for his presentation, and ask if he does not agree that there are two things that must be done in this field. The first one is to protect the United States against the release of information which would be of value to an enemy or potential enemy.

The second is to protect the public of the United States against having the public's business kept secret when there is no real reason why it should not be made public.

Mr. BENTON. I agree this comment, coming from the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan, who has had a long and distinguished career as one of our leading journalists, is particularly appropriate.

My criticism of the President's order is that it does not go far enough, that it emphasizes only one side of the coin—

Mr. MOODY. Without considering both sides.

Mr. BENTON. Without emphasizing the other side of the coin, which in my judgment may be potentially the more important side of the coin and the more difficult on which to make progress.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MOODY. I am very much interested in the Senator's suggestion of having what he calls a top-ranking advocate of the people's right to know. I think that puts it very well.

I may say to the Senator that yesterday afternoon when I returned to the city I called Joe Short, the President's Secretary, about this question. I am, of course, convinced that there was no sinister intent in this order. It is an order which has been under consideration for a long time. I understand that some newspaper editors were consulted about it, but that there was no complete agreement on the question. I suggested to the White House that it might be well—in fact, it should be done, in my judgment—to appoint now a committee of top-ranking newspapermen. That committee should be charged, in my judgment, with the responsibility of reviewing this order. If selected from

among editors, the committee could consist of men like Mark Ethridge, of the Louisville Courier-Journal; Lawrence L. Winship, editor of the Boston Globe; and Fred Gaertner, Jr., managing editor of the Detroit News. These and many others would be highly qualified to advise on this issue. It would be even better to assign this advisory responsibility to Washington correspondents like Raymond P. Brandt, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Frederick W. Collins, of the Providence Journal; Marquis Childs, the widely known columnist.

Mr. President, I have named only a few.

There are many newspaper men who could be counted upon to review this order having in mind the two points I made a few minutes ago; first, the absolute necessity of keeping vital information away from the enemy; and second, the equally absolute necessity of not keeping away from the public anything that would not be of benefit to the enemy.

I should like to have the Senator's view as to whether he thinks it would be wise to call in newspapermen at this point and say, "Go over this order and tell us what is wrong with it. Give us advice as to how you would change it." I think it would be better to have active Washington newspapermen appointed to such a committee if possible.

Mr. BENTON. I very much like the suggestion of securing the views of our leading correspondents and journalists, Mr. President, though I am not sure I would want to take the responsibility, if I were the President, of selecting some newspapermen and excluding others. If the American Society of Newspaper Editors were to establish a committee to do what is being suggested by the junior Senator from Michigan, I believe that the findings of that committee would fall upon most receptive ground. The President in his statement shows that he is very much aware of the problem.

Mr. MOODY. Of course he is aware of it.

Mr. BENTON. The President expresses the hope that the policy he is setting forth will mean that the American people will receive more rather than less information about their Government. Of course, all of us share that hope.

Mr. MOODY. Certainly.

Mr. BENTON. The problem is whether that hope will be realized under the order as it is presently drawn up, and presently operating. I think the present need is to go still further, and I am sure the President will endeavor to go much further, in supplementing his present order, with a new order so as to give greater assurance that the hope which he has expressed can be realized.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to point out that the first sentence of the President's statement expresses his purpose and hope. He says:

I have today signed an Executive order to strengthen our safeguards against divulging to potential enemies information harmful to the security of the United States.

There is nothing wrong with that purpose.

Mr. BENTON. On the contrary, we must have uniform standards throughout the Government agencies. That is one reason why the order should not be repealed as demanded by the senior Senator from Michigan. It ought to be strengthened with other directives, to enhance the chance for the achievement of the hope which he expresses, that the American people will receive more rather than less information about their Government.

Mr. MOODY. I am sure that if there were appointed a committee of the sort I mentioned a few moments ago, either named by the Society of Newspaper Editors or named from the active corps of Washington correspondents, it would constitute a step in the right direction. In my judgment the Washington correspondents know more about this subject than any other group of men in the world. I think they know more than the editors know about it. I think they would do a better job in guiding the Government as to just what should be done in this kind of situation; and they would do an equally responsible job. I should like to see the Washington press corps take this subject in hand, or be given the opportunity of taking it in hand, to work out the sort of system which would protect us against the release of vital information to the enemy, and at the same time would make it perfectly certain, as nearly as any human relationship can be, that there will not be any clogging of the channels of information between the Government and the people.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I very much welcome the interruption of the Senator from Michigan. I trust his suggestions will reach the ears of the officers of the Press Club in Washington, as well as the ears of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and that they will receive the consideration which I feel they deserve.

I am sure it will interest the junior Senator from Michigan to know that serving with me on the subcommittee of the Committee for Economic Development, under the chairmanship of Mr. Lazarus, was Mr. Gardiner Cowles, the distinguished newspaper and magazine editor and publisher. Mr. Cowles had served during the war in the top role with the OWI. His observations as a result of his experience with the OWI coincided with my observations as a result of my experience in the State Department. We agreed that a real attack on the problem of disclosure requires an officer of the Government at the very highest level, with the right of appeal from the secretaries who head the great Government departments, with the constant determination to force an unending review of every case that can be made for disclosure. This cannot be done at a low level through subordinate officers, even officers with the rank of assistant secretary, in any one or all of the Government departments.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not true that while we must constantly bear in mind the obvious necessity of keeping information away from the enemy, we must guard against the use of the power to classify and make information secret for the purpose of covering up errors, or anything else anyone may want to cover up? Is not that the core of what must be gotten at in an amended or revised rule? It may be that the rule can be revised or amended, or it might be better to rescind it and issue a new one. I am not passing on that question now. All I emphasize is that we must not, in the interest of guarding the secrets of the Government, which must be guarded, clog the channels of information and allow officials in the departments to use the stamp for their own personal purposes.

Mr. BENTON. I agree further, the Senator's suggestions are received by me with strong personal feeling growing out of my experience in the State Department, where I had a very large amount of authority and power while serving as Assistant Secretary. The authority which I then exercised is far beyond the authority in the hands of the Assistant Secretaries today. There were fewer of us. We had fewer superiors. I reported directly to Secretary Byrnes, who was out of the country much of the time. For all practical purposes I found myself operating what often seemed to be a virtually independent, though affiliated, Government agency. If I could not get the job done in the State Department at that time, when I had that much authority and power, in my early weeks having about half the officials and employees in the State Department working under me, this should serve to demonstrate how difficult the problem of disclosure is, and why Mr. Cowles and I and others on the CED committee so urgently recommended the appointment of a civilian officer of the Government at the very highest level, with the right of appeal over the heads of the Cabinet officers to the President himself, to force and keep forcing the case for disclosure, and to act as the people's advocate on behalf of us all.

To conclude my statement, Mr. President, I first suggest simplifying the four security categories by dropping one, namely, the "restricted" classification, and secondly I urge the adoption of the two recommendations which I have just outlined for the administration of the handling of information. If these recommendations are followed, we can, I think, be much more certain that the hope expressed by the President, that the American people will get more information, will be realized.

Let me urge that only a small and limited list of officers be allowed to classify information as "secret," and even a smaller group as "top secret." The right of the people to know what is going on in Government is classic American doctrine. If we are to face a continuing crisis over a period of years—possibly a 15-year crisis of national security, as suggested by some—this doctrine will be subjected to unprecedented strain.

This doctrine so essential to our liberties and our freedoms must therefore be restated and refurbished, not only today and this week, but again and again as we look ahead, and it must be carried out in action. The suggestions I have made today are proposals for positive action which I feel this time of crisis requires.

EXHIBIT 1

CLASSIFYING INFORMATION

The sweeping Presidential order providing for the classification of information throughout all the executive branch of the Government raises serious questions. It goes without saying that there are some matters essential to the national defense that need to be kept secret. It is also apparent that we would profit by some uniform system of classification and release. But after those things are taken into account there is still reason to question the wisdom of the form in which action has been taken.

The Presidential order is broad in its powers but vague in its definitions. A striking weakness is the failure to make any provision for systematic and periodic review of how it is being put into use. Vast discretion is placed in the hands of a large number of officials with no adequate check upon how that discretion is exercised. The result is that the effect of this order will depend on a considerable number of very fallible human judgments. If those judgments are uniformly good the procedure may do little harm. If the judgments are bad the machinery that the President has authorized can be used primarily not to protect national security but to cover up the mistakes of officeholders that ought to be exposed.

Unfortunately, the tendency in the classifying of information is almost invariably to over-classify rather than to under-classify it. It is much safer for an uneasy security officer to stamp a document secret than to authorize its release. Some of the abuses of this tendency in the past have been positively fantastic, and there is reason to be apprehensive over their possible repetition under a system without adequate safeguards.

Thomas Jefferson several times pointed out that the success of real government by consent depended primarily upon the enlightenment of the electorate. A policy that tends to dry up information at the source through the device of classification will work against that enlightenment. We do not want security information to come into the hands of our adversaries if it can be avoided. But we do want all sorts of information in the hands of our public all the time.

The President's order will be justified only if it is carried out with supreme skill and intelligence. That puts a heavy burden on a very large number of persons.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 2, 1951, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1786) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions and catastrophes of nature.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. KARL STEFAN, late a Representative

from the State of Nebraska, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution; and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1183. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended; and

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the recognition and endorsement of the World Metallurgical Congress.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 3, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1183) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended.

REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 227)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives, p. 12558.)

EMERGENCY PROFESSIONAL HEALTH TRAINING ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946, to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Emergency Health Training Act, S. 337. I address you from many years of experience as a member of the board of one of the great voluntary hospitals in New York City, as well as a trustee of several of our institutions of higher learning. Out of these experiences I can testify that, today, even the maximum support from private givers will not solve the desperate financial plight of our medical, dental, and nursing schools.

As chairman of the Health Subcommittee, I have found the problem of the shortage of doctors and other health personnel confronting us at every turn. Almost every health problem, almost every measure to improve the health of the Nation runs into this same obstacle. And the professional schools which must train these people tell me, and tell my committee, that large-scale expansion of their training program and facilities is impossible without outside help.

As a former Governor of the State of New York, I can support the evidence that has come in from many States that the State legislatures simply cannot find

the funds to sustain and enlarge their medical and nursing schools.

The process of training a physician or dentist involves one of the most arduous, detailed, and varied courses of study in our whole educational system today. Consider the complicated process of making out of an intelligent youth the kind of physician capable of dealing day after day with life-and-death matters, using the latest scientific knowledge, and often involving diagnosis of complicated and obscure illnesses. Training a graduate nurse is likewise a process that involves a wide range of learning. Both require detailed and skilled supervision. For the very selfish reason that we and our families are the users of these services we would not want anything less than the very best training for doctors and nurses and other medical professionals.

Medical education is the most expensive form of training there is. One of the clearest expositions of why it must be so expensive is contained in a brochure prepared by the National Fund for Medical Education, Inc., of which former President Herbert Hoover is honorary chairman, and which includes on its board of trustees many eminent industrialists, educators, and civic leaders. They say this:

Medical education today is the most expensive field of education because of the special and intricate pedagogic techniques needed to train doctors and the personal relationship among doctors, student, and patient in the clinical years.

More specifically, the following factors combine to raise the cost of medical education:

1. The public and medical profession insist that every prospective physician undergo an intensive period of individual study in classrooms, laboratories, and hospitals before he can be allowed to assume responsibility for the life and death of his fellow-men.

2. The training of doctors involves a large number of highly skilled teachers in proportion to the number of students—teachers who must be paid adequate salaries.

3. Medical education requires extensive laboratory facilities and specialized equipment which are costly to secure and maintain.

The cost of all this education, for each student, runs to over \$2,500 a year. It may be even higher, since the last such estimate was made for the school year 1947-48. In subsequent years inflation has forced the budgets of the medical schools up some 40 percent.

How are these costs met? Only about 25 percent comes from the tuition paid by the individual student. The remaining \$1,875 for each student each year must be furnished by the school. Deans of the medical colleges, and such committees as the Surgeon General's committee on medical school grants and finances agree that tuition cannot be raised further without barring many deserving students.

I should like to call that 25 percent figure to the attention of my colleagues who asked, when this measure first came up on the consent calendar, whether the funds authorized for tuition and living costs for needy individual medical students under the selective service bill would not be sufficient. The reverse is

true. Every time you enable an additional student to attend medical school, you are increasing the costs to that school by an average of \$1,875 a year. The Congress must recognize that the sections of S. 337 which will enable schools to meet the costs of instructing increasing numbers of students, and the bill's provisions for grants to construct and renovate needed facilities, are an integral part of any plan to increase the number of doctors.

Despite the vast improvements that have been made since the end of World War II, I am sure that Senators will find, even on a quick visit to medical schools in their own States, that physical facilities are generally shabby, overcrowded, and makeshift. Even some of our greatest training institutions still must teach and house their students in what can only be described as very distressing conditions.

I also invite attention to the fact that one whole great sector of the medical profession—graduate nurses—is made up almost entirely of women. Right now, according to the six national nursing organizations, there is a critical shortage of nurses. For civilian needs alone, there should be 65,000 more professional nurses. The Army is trying to recruit 3,000 nurses. I cannot foresee a lessening in the demands from the military authorities for graduate nurses. There is nothing in the Selective Service Act which will do what is proposed in this measure—provide funds for the schools to train additional doctors, dentists, and nurses.

The recent report of the Surgeon General's Committee on Medical School Grants and Finances concluded that, simply to continue operating at present levels, the 79 medical schools need an additional \$40,000,000 a year in current operating funds, plus another \$330,000,000 for construction of facilities. These figures were supplied by the deans of the medical schools. And let me remind the Senate again that these figures were furnished in 1947-48 and now have been forced up 40 percent by inflation. These same men estimate that to put into effect their very laudable plans to increase enrollment by 22 percent would require an additional \$18,000,000 for support of operations, and \$244,000,000 for construction of facilities.

Surely, Mr. President, in view of the magnitude of the problem of doctor-training institutions alone, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has proposed a very modest and frugal program. I shall not attempt at this point to give the costs of each category of aid which is proposed to be given to the training of doctors, nurses, and so forth. In each category of that undertaking the figures may be given more expertly by some of my colleagues during the remainder of the debate. I am glad to say, however, that it is estimated that under the bill the potential increases in personnel for 5 years' operation of the program would be 6,000 physicians, 2,900 dentists, and 33,000 graduate nurses, in addition to approximately 53,000 more practical nurses as a result of the institutional program for vocational training of practical nurses.

Mr. President, in my opinion, if there is any criticism of the amounts called for by Senate bill 337, it should be directed at the insufficiency of the sum. The sponsors of the bill may well be asked whether they have raised their sights high enough to enable our professional training centers to do more than stave off impending disaster. But surely, in view of the health needs of our armed forces and civilians, we can do no less and we must do no less than is provided for in Senate bill 337.

Mr. BENTON obtained the floor.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I shall be glad to yield if I do not lose my place on the floor.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, is a cosponsor of the pending measure and is now in the city of Detroit, Mich. He is there because more than 2,000 people have gathered there to pay him honor for the contributions he has made to the health and welfare of our people during his 17 years in the Senate of the United States. He is a student of the subject covered by the bill and has lived with it for more than 3 years. On the basis of that knowledge he has had prepared a telling address urging the Senate to pass the bill. I ask unanimous consent that his address be placed in the RECORD at this point as part of the debate, because I feel that his views are extremely important.

There being no objection, the address prepared by Mr. MURRAY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS PREPARED BY SENATOR MURRAY

Mr. President, "Emergency," the first word in the title of the bill before you, conveys the sense of urgency concerning S. 337 which is shared by all members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

That sense of urgency was impressed upon each of us by the testimony of scores of the country's most distinguished educators, by the deans of medical schools, and by spokesmen for medical, dental, nursing, public health, and other professional organizations. Our unanimous bipartisan sponsorship of this emergency measure attests to the gravity of the country's need for more doctors, nurses, and other health experts.

Our unanimous bipartisan sponsorship of this emergency measure bespeaks how clearly and unequivocally we realize that a financial crisis is undermining the great professional centers which are our only sources of such personnel.

Our unanimous bipartisan sponsorship of this emergency bill declares our conviction that at stake here is the health of every now living American, to say nothing of the health of our children a generation hence.

This is not overstatement to catch the attention of the Senate. I come to the choice of these words reluctantly. But lesser ones will not do. So with all the force and earnestness and conviction that is in me I urge your prompt approval of an emergency bill which will halt—at least temporarily—the deterioration of professional training and which will lessen the mounting shortage of professional personnel in the field of health.

Who among us here is not conscious that our Nation—the richest in the world—does not have enough physicians and dentists and nurses? Ever since 1939, when I first became a member of the Senate committee considering this problem, the statement that

we do not have enough trained health personnel to put into effect certain contemplated health programs, however, desirable they may be, has been made by spokesmen of the American Medical Association. I can recall warnings from AMA officers that we do not have enough physicians to meet the increased burden which would be entailed by making the benefits of preventive medicine available to all our people. Similarly, when proposals were made involving nothing more drastic than one physical examination a year for each person in the country, we have been told by representatives of the American Medical Association that we simply do not have sufficient trained health personnel to do the job.

Those warnings from the American Medical Association, while they undoubtedly were not uttered for that purpose, Mr. President, were nonetheless useful in focusing attention on the whole question of the training of health personnel and the adequacy of their numbers for our growing population. They are most significant, Mr. President, because they were made time and time again by spokesmen of the one organization which, now that we are considering legislation designed to produce more doctors, dares to suggest that perhaps we do have sufficient doctors after all.

But I know I need not labor the point. My colleagues have already so established our need for more physicians, dentists, and nurses as to leave no doubt but that it is real and that it presents a most pressing problem. To what they have said on this point I will add but one set of figures and two illustrations of that shortage. Mr. President, between 1910 and 1940, the population of this country rose 43 percent. During that same period the number of lawyers increased 58 percent; dentists, 76 percent; teachers, 86 percent; engineers, 212 percent; and physicians only 30 percent. So much for figures.

Now as to whether or not particular localities have enough medical personnel to meet the needs of their people, let us take but two simple illustrations, neither of them extreme; neither of them overdrawn. Ordinarily when we think of doctor shortages, we think in terms of rural areas. We assume that great industrial States such as Pennsylvania are well provided with medical personnel and that if other areas need doctors, it is from these States that they should be recruited. Well, if this be true, Mr. President, then certainly one would expect that in a city like Philadelphia with its great concentration of physicians—about 1 to every 425 inhabitants—we would find the surplus of physicians from which to recruit the medical men needed so badly elsewhere. But it just isn't so, Mr. President. Dr. Perkins, dean of the Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia, has stated that—and I quote—"even Philadelphia, with all its great medical resources, is none too well manned and has no surplus of physicians."

If Philadelphia, with 1 doctor for each 425 people, has no surplus, what then shall we say of the great State of Virginia where 29 counties have less than 1 doctor for each 3,000 people; where 4 counties have less than 1 doctor for each 10,000 people; and where 1 county has but 1 doctor for each 24,000 people. Or what of the great and well-to-do State of Ohio where in only 11 out of 48 counties is there a doctor for each 1,000 people and where in 12 counties there are more than 2,000 people per doctor? Those figures, Mr. President, were sent me by the Governors of Virginia and Ohio and, out of deference to my colleagues from those States, I hasten to repeat what I have already said—these are not extreme situations. The condition is far more serious in many other counties in many, many more States of the Union.

So much for our need for more medical men.

I shall be even more brief as regards the financial problem in the field of medical education since that too has been so well covered by my colleagues of your Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. First, as to how that problem affects the young men and women who are eager to serve humanity as physicians or surgeons, permit me just one illustration. This year the tuition fee at the University of Louisville Medical School has been raised to \$800 for Kentucky students and to \$1,200 a year for out-of-State students. As the Louisville Courier-Journal pointed out in an editorial urging the passage of this legislation, the raising of tuition rates to these awesome heights was forced upon the school by the financial difficulties it faced. But, Mr. President, as the Courier-Journal also said—and I quote—"It will make it practically impossible for the son of the average Kentucky family to become a doctor" and "It will not increase enrollment or help to ease Kentucky's doctor shortage." The editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal makes a very cogent plea for the passage of this bill, Mr. President. I sincerely hope that in so doing he reflects the thinking of the people of that State and of our distinguished colleagues from Kentucky. Certainly, his editorial convincingly sets forth part of the reasoning which forces our committee to urge the passage of S. 337.

Now, turning from the financial problem of the student to that of the schools, I should like to read in its entirety an article which appeared in the July issue of the Journal of Medical Education. I do this because I know of no more objective, thorough-going, excellently-reasoned presentation of the various alternatives which confront us when we think, as we must, of the financial problems confronting our medical schools—and permit me to say in passing that these problems and these same alternative solutions apply to our schools of dentistry, of nursing, and of public health as well.

The article is entitled, "The Financial Problem—A Balanced Solution." It reads as follows:

"A financial crisis faces the Nation's 79 medical schools today. It is of such gravity that the very existence of some of these schools is at stake. The standards of all of them are in jeopardy.

"At a recent meeting of the National Fund for Medical Education, Herbert Hoover, the honorary chairman of the fund, revealed that one university has deferred for a year a decision to abandon its medical school 'because its deficits are too much of a drag on the whole institution.' At another medical school the university authorities have debated, in recent years, the advisability of continuing to operate their school in the face of crippling costs. In both instances, the schools in question are privately operated. Both are parts of prominent universities. These are not examples of freakish economic situations in isolated medical educational communities. On the contrary, they are the end result, or near end result, of a process that has been in operation for some years, one which, sooner or later, will present all private schools and many State schools with insuperable financial problems.

"The present situation reaches a climax at a time when the national defense effort, spurred by the war in Korea, calls for the attaining of ever higher standards in medical education and the production not only of the most competent doctors but increasing numbers of doctors as well. Medical schools the Nation over are already practicing rigid economies to keep afloat and to meet the obligations of the hour, yet no dean of a medical school wishes to court the prospect of returning to the pre-Flexner days in medical education.

"No financial wizard has arrived on the scene with an easy answer to the schools'.

problem; it is doubtful that there is one. A certain amount of reflection, however, will show that there are at least three possible approaches to a solution:

"1. Medical schools in financial distress can retrench. By continuing to snip away at the teaching program, by reducing equipment and the cost of instruction, it may be possible to bring expenses within hailing distance of current resources. That this would have a devastating effect on the caliber of instruction and thus on the competence of the next generation of medical graduates, no informed person denies. At best, this approach—the idea of economizing through the evisceration of the teaching program—represents a foolish saving in money. It is an utter extravagance as far as the Nation's health is concerned. In the long run we would all pay dearly for such budget-slashing in terms of health standards and the demands of national defense. There is no sense in spending needlessly more than one earns, but there is as little sense in turning out a second-rate product, especially when the well-being of the Nation is at stake. American medicine would not be supreme in the world today had our medical schools not viewed, as their primary objective, the production of competent doctors thoroughly trained in the complexities of modern chemical, physical, and biological science.

"2. A second possibility, a far more constructive one than blind budget-cutting, is for the medical schools to band together behind such an organization as the National Fund for Medical Education, a voluntary effort which is seeking its sustenance from a wide variety of interests in the American community. The fund represents a fresh and inspiring approach to a solution of the schools' financial problem. The deans have backed it wholeheartedly. Many of them have given much time and effort to this organization which, in the long run, may provide an original formula for the solution of the financial problems of higher education. In 2 years of organizational work the fund has collected something over \$1,000,000, more than half of this coming from the American Medical Association's American Medical Education Foundation. The association is to be congratulated on its foresighted and constructive efforts in this direction.

"3. A third method, and, we think, the most imperative at the moment, is to seek Federal aid to help to meet a mounting disaster before it is too late to take successful remedial action. The deans, therefore, are backing S. 337, a bill that has been reported favorably by unanimous vote by the Senate's Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It has the endorsement of the leaders of both major political parties. From medicine's viewpoint, S. 337 is a good bill and it deserves the support of those who are interested in maintaining the standards of medical education in the United States. This bill is written as a temporary measure to help the schools through the present critical period. As hopeful as the National fund may make us feel about the future of medical education, the fund probably cannot stimulate more than a trickle of funds for the next year or two, or perhaps for the next 5 years. The fund's objective for the first year is \$5,000,000, yet the Reed report estimates that the present needs of the 79 schools run to something like \$40,000,000 annually in excess of their currently available funds; about \$30,000,000 represents money needed by the private schools. Without additional support of this order of magnitude, the medical schools cannot do the job being demanded of them today.

"It goes without saying that the strength and independence of the medical school lies in maintaining a balance between their own unrestricted revenue, principally from private sources, and funds made available through the taxing agencies of Government. It would seem, then, if one views the present

problem objectively, that the soundest approach for the medical deans lies in the continued and vigorous appeal for temporary Federal assistance. We must continue to practice all sensible economies meanwhile, but we must be ever mindful that our job is to produce doctors worthy of the name, not just individuals who carry the identification 'M. D.' With this approach, we shall be able to weather severe financial storms, which may otherwise wreck our ship, and to sail on to new horizons in medicine."

There, gentlemen, is one of the most lucid and convincing presentations of the role which S. 337 can and should play in aiding our schools of medicine to overcome the financial crisis with which they are threatened that I have seen. Its logic applies even more strongly to our schools of nursing and of dentistry which cannot even hope for such aid as the national fund may in the future bring to our schools of medicine.

Mr. President, I am sure I need say no more concerning either the Nation's need for more doctors and nurses or the need of the schools for financial aid. The most important question which remains is whether or not this bill, S. 337, provides a sound method of meeting those needs. The distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island, in explaining the terms of the bill, has proved beyond question that it does. To his remarks, I should like to add the fact that to my knowledge neither in this nor in any other Congress during the 17 years I have served in this body, has our committee reported to the Senate a bill so thoroughly studied or so carefully drafted as the one we are now considering.

We began work on this measure in the spring of 1949, Mr. President. We took testimony on the broad question of national health needs from a great many civic organizations. We found that while there were many and strong differences of opinion on certain proposals, invariably the witnesses agreed first, that there was a most decided need for professional personnel in the health field and, secondly, that the Federal Government had an obligation to help meet that need. As illustrative of this attitude let me quote the testimony given a House Committee by Mr. Hugh Murray, Jr., speaking as the representative not of any liberal cause group but as the official representative of the conservative National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents. Mr. Murray—I assure you he is no relation—said, "The association I represent is categorically opposed to all of the proposed national health insurance programs, as such, when considered in its entirety." Here is no radical, Mr. President. But Mr. Murray went on to say, and again I quote, "However, in practically all of the legislation on this subject now pending before your committee and the comparable committee in the Senate, there are contained certain provisions which we heartily endorse as being in the future interest and welfare of this Nation from the standpoint of health and longevity.

"I refer to those provisions for aiding and fostering the education and development of a great number of physicians, dentists, and nurses, and for providing erection of vast numbers of hospitals and clinics throughout the country, both urgently needed.

"We believe in 'first things first.' We don't want the cart before the horse.

"It is an indisputable fact that there is a terrific shortage of doctors, dentists, and nurses in the United States."

Then Mr. Murray went on to say, "We believe that the following legislative actions will solve the basic problems involved:

"(a) By aiding the education and development of a tremendous number of doctors, dentists, and nurses.

"Obviously, no health program can hope to accomplish anything without trained personnel to provide adequate medical attention."

And, Mr. President, permit me to quote from the testimony given us by another organization ordinarily regarded as thoroughly responsible and conservative—the American Farm Bureau Federation. Here is what Mr. H. E. Slusher, president of the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation and chairman of the health committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation, told our committee:

"We also urge that facilities of medical schools be expanded, and that every effort be made to train more physicians, surgeons, dentists, nurses, technicians, and general practitioners, and public health doctors. We feel there can be no real solution to the health problem until sufficient men and women are available to meet the need."

Those statements, Mr. President, are typical of the testimony we received from lay groups. But, in addition, Mr. President, we took prolonged and carefully analyzed testimony from no less than 18 organizations representing the professional organizations directly concerned with education in the field of health or with practice in that field. They included such organizations as the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association; the Association of American Medical Colleges and the American Council on Education; the National Association of State Universities, and the Catholic Hospital Association. The list is too long to read in its entirety, Mr. President, but I have it here and I include it following my remarks.

Mr. President, every one of these 18 organizations approved the principles underlying this bill—almost without exception they urged us to take prompt action expressing grave concern over the current situation. And that, Mr. President, was before Korea. Here are some of the things they said:

The representative of the American Medical Association, commenting on the fact that medical school budgets had doubled in 15 years, said, and I quote: "Despite this increase, practically all medical schools require additional funds if they are to make maximum use of their present facilities and if they are to offer educational programs that approach the ideal." Asked how much the medical schools needed, the AMA's spokesman expressed himself as uncertain but quoted a study made by the AMA's Council in 1949 in which the schools estimated their need for increased funds for operational purposes alone at from ten to fifteen million dollars a year. And he went on to say, I quote, "I would emphasize a point that has already been emphasized, I think, by each speaker this morning. If the quality of medical education is to be preserved, the schools must be provided with sufficient funds to correct deficiencies in their present programs before they undertake to train an increased number of students." Furthermore, Mr. President, and this point has since become more important, the American Medical Association representative, when queried about the possibility of Federal interference with the schools, admitted that to the best of his knowledge, the Federal Government has never interfered in the manner in which expansion of hospitals, the establishment of clinics, or the conduct of research in medical schools—all financed in part by the Federal Government—were carried on.

General Simmons, speaking for the Schools of Public Health, pointed out that 80 percent of their graduates work for government—Federal, State, or local. Obviously, it would be most unfair to ask the taxpayers in just a few States to support these schools which meet the needs of the Nation. And it is equally obvious that it would be most absurd and wasteful were each State to finance its own school of public health when, by expanding the 9 schools of public health now in existence or by adding three or four more, we can more than adequately meet those needs. Federal aid was the only an-

swer, he insisted, and as to any consequent Federal control he stated, and I quote, "I have no fear of it."

Such was the type of testimony we received from all the witnesses representing the professional groups. They spoke of critical needs; of acute shortages; of crippling financial problems; and of urgent needs. And these were wise, intelligent, sincere, and patriotic men and women holding responsible positions, Mr. President. They not only spoke in vigorous, appealing phrases, but they provided example after example of real, concrete cases to sustain their statements. Take, for instance, the dean of Iowa State University's medical school. He represented not only his school but the Association of American Medical Colleges and he spoke for the National Association of State Universities as well. Dr. Jacobsen told us that at his school, while the student body remained as large and while under great pressure to take in still more students, they had had to delete from the school's budget, one professor, two associate professors, four assistant professors, and two instructors. "In our department of obstetrics," he told us, "the staff has been reduced from five to three—a dangerously low level."

Such was the testimony we received from all these organizations, Mr. President. And as their representatives testified, I want the Senate to know, we sedulously inquired of them regarding a major point since raised in opposition to this bill—the fear of Federal control. Mr. President, just 1 of these 18 professional organizations expressed that fear as regards the bill now under consideration. Later, it said the fear was resolved. Now it has changed its mind again. That organization was the American Medical Association. One out of eighteen, Mr. President, and that one is the only one which has never had direct experience with Federal aid. The other seventeen have had such experience—some for over 90 years—and these experienced organizations unanimously agreed that as regards this bill, they had no such fear.

It was through such hearings, Mr. President, and because of such testimony that the entire membership of our committee—composed of Republicans and Democrats representing every section of the country—was convinced that this bill was most urgently needed, that it was basically sound, and that we should urge its enactment.

But, Mr. President, we did not stop there in our efforts to perfect the bill. After all the public hearings were over we called in some 38 experts from the schools and universities, from the American Medical Association, and the American Dental Association, and the hospital organizations. In all they represented 40 institutions or associations. We closeted them with our staff, and we asked them to go over the bill line for line, to rewrite it completely so as to be sure it would do the job intended and do it without any untoward effects. That group worked and worked with great thoroughness and deliberation. And, Mr. President, before they were through they presented us with a redrafted bill, which as I have said before is one of the most carefully drawn we have ever seen. I have here, Mr. President, the report they made us and on the basis of which, in a whole series of working executive sessions, your committee finally drafted the bill upon which the one now before us is modeled.

Mr. President, I want to read to the Senate just a few pages from that report. But because it proves so conclusively that this measure was soundly conceived and thoroughly thought out, I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the appendix of today's RECORD. Here, Mr. President, is, in part, the report made to us by Dr. Lowell J. Reed, of Johns Hopkins University, who acted as chairman of the group I've referred to.

Referring to the general principles which the consultants felt must be carefully considered in any such legislation, Dr. Reed said as follows:

"Even more significant than the agreement on specific provisions which the several professional groups reached is the broad area of agreement on general issues and principles. There was no intention or effort at the start of the series of meetings to try to develop a group of underlying or general principles which would apply to all professional categories, but, as the meetings progressed, each group brought forward a set of prerequisites or essentials to any legislation in its particular field. The significant thing is that there was such an extraordinary degree of similarity in the general principles which were volunteered by each group in turn and which can be said, therefore, to represent agreement on fundamental considerations.

"These points of agreement are so straightforward that they require no substantial elaboration or explanation.

"1. There is a financial emergency in the schools which train for the health professions that requires emergency action. Pending legislative proposals are intended to deal with this emergency. The specific provisions agreed upon as interim measures are subject to the finding of further facts through an intensive study during the first 3 years of operation on which a continuing program can be predicated.

"2. There is a recognized need for a definitive study of needs and costs of training for the health professions. Enough information is now available upon which to rest a sound program of emergency assistance, but a continuing program will require more complete data on needs and costs. This information could be gathered and presented to the Congress within 3 years.

"3. All educators agree that the principle of local support and responsibility for these training institutions is of the highest importance and that any Federal support should be provided under conditions or limitations that recognize this principle. Federal assistance should be in supplementation of existing funds and some method should be found whereby the provision of Federal funds does not result in the withdrawal of funds from existing sources. The Federal contribution should not be more than a fixed proportion of the total institutional budget.

"4. In the determination by the Federal administering authority of accredited schools eligible to receive Federal assistance use should be made of the recognized professional accrediting bodies.

"5. The accrediting bodies which have been established in each of the professions should remain the principal guarantors and protectors of the quality of instruction.

"6. Federal interference with faculty appointments, professional curricula, admission policies, or the internal management of the schools must be avoided.

"7. There are recognized shortages of manpower in the health professions and many schools are already doing all they can to help meet these shortages in their present financial situation. Substantial expansion to meet the needs of the country cannot be expected until some financial stability for present enrollments has been achieved.

"8. Existing private sources of income are not able to meet the large needs of the medical and other schools for increased operating expenses, for necessary improvements and modernization, and for expansion.

"9. Scholarships will be helpful in equalizing educational opportunity for those who desire to get training in the health professions, but they ought to be awarded only to students who have previously been admitted to an accredited school.

"10. Indentured service provisions are contrary to sound educational policy and also unworkable.

"11. The need of the schools for construction is very great both for new space and replacement space. The inclusion of construction funds for replacement in present legislation should be addressed to efforts to relieve manpower shortages. If construction funds are provided there should be a limitation on the total Federal contribution.

"12. Regulations should be established and major administrative policies determined only after obtaining the advice and recommendations of an advisory council representative of the educational institutions and health professions and of the general public.

"13. The advisory council's recommendations on major matters should be reported to the Congress by the Surgeon General and the council should be given the assistance of technical committees of experts in the various fields covered by the program."

Mr. President, every one of those principles formulated by this group of outstanding experts has been incorporated in the bill now before you. It is a needed bill. It is a soundly drafted bill. It is a good bill.

But, Mr. President, this bill is now opposed. At one time when the need was not so urgent this bill had the endorsement of every group concerned with its objectives. And at that time this bill passed the Senate without a single dissenting vote. But since then, Mr. President, two things have happened. First, the Nation's need for this legislation has increased immeasurably since Korea. The second thing that has happened is that one organization—one and only one of the organizations which supported it now opposes the bill. The first change, Mr. President—the increased need—is one which should weigh heavily upon us, which should compel us to pass the bill without delay. The second change—the double talking of one organization—should be of no concern to us at all. However, since this one organization maintains a \$3,000,000 a year lobby capable of flooding the country with half truths and untruths, I feel constrained to comment on its position. For since the organizations supporting this measure cannot carry this story to all the people, it should at least be set forth in the record we are making here today.

Now, Mr. President, we know of the groups which support this bill. The American Dental Association is patriotic enough, unselfish enough, intelligent enough to urge us to pass it promptly. And the men who know the most about it, the men and women who manage our medical, dental, and nursing schools—they, too, urge its passage. And the men who would most fervently resist any encroachment on their freedom by the Federal Government—the presidents of our State universities, our land-grant colleges, and our great privately controlled universities. They, too, urge its passage. So, too, do veterans who know that 12 whole hospitals for veterans stand empty because we cannot find the personnel with which to staff them. The Legion and the DAV urge you to pass this bill. And the Grange does, and the A. F. of L. and the CIO. So does every conscious, knowledgeable, patriotic, and unselfish group in the country. I shall not attempt to list them all. Reference to most of them has been made by my colleagues.

But, Mr. President, we cannot hide the fact that there is one group which today violently opposes this bill to provide the Nation with the kind and the numbers of doctors and nurses we need. The American Medical Association tells you not to pass this bill. The AMA is the one organization which once supported the bill but which now—although nothing has changed save that we need it more than ever—demands that you, too, reverse yourselves and vote it down. The AMA is the only organization which, by its own admission, has wired, and I quote the AMA's own bulletin: "The members of its legislative committee asking them to notify" their key men that the medical education bill was

likely to come to the floor of the Senate this week and requested that they get in touch with their Senator."

Well, gentlemen, I assume you have been gotten in touch with. I assume you know that the top command of the AMA wants you to defeat this bill. I assume you know that most of the AMA members, the doctors who are too busy healing the sick to politic, have never studied this bill. I assume that you know that those members of the AMA who know most about the bill—the deans of the medical schools—want it passed. And I assume—rather, I am sure—that despite a lobby spending three millions a year to influence legislation, I am sure you will defy that lobby and in the interests of this Nation and of the States you represent vote overwhelmingly to pass the bill.

I know you will because you know as do I that the AMA's position on this measure is absolutely untenable. You know, as I do, how false, how hollow-sounding, how thoroughly unworthy of credence are the arguments with which the AMA now opposes its passage. But, just so that the record may be clear, permit me to review the following facts.

The AMA testified for this bill. It admitted the need of the schools for more funds and the need of the Nation for more doctors. True, it did not think the need as great as do we. But the secretary of the AMA's council on medical education and hospitals insisted way back in October of 1947, and I quote him, "We are prepared to contend that the maximum deficit that could possibly be forecast for 1960 does not exceed 15,000 physicians", unquote. That's all, gentlemen, nothing serious; just 15,000 physicians short by 1960; just enough to take care of from ten to fifteen million Americans. Those were the AMA's pre-Korea figures, gentlemen. Now they tell us not to worry about this shortage. They tell us not to pass this bill because, one, there may be no shortage; two, Federal aid might mean Federal control; and, three, because although the schools desperately need tens of millions of dollars, voluntary contributions will take care of that need.

Well, gentlemen, I've quoted the AMA itself on the first of these claims. The last I'll come to later. But right now let me just remind you that the AMA once unequivocally supported this bill. I've quoted its testimony given before the bill was in final form. In that testimony it admitted the need of the Nation and of the schools. But it feared the possibility of Federal control of the schools unless adequate protections against that possibility were written into the bill.

Well, Mr. President, those protections were written into the bill as you have been told. And, Mr. President, the AMA recognized that fact. In December of 1949, the house of delegates of the AMA approved a report by its council on medical education which said that while it was not entirely satisfied with the bill (primarily because we recognize osteopathic schools as do the States); nonetheless, the bill did contain, and I quote from the journal of the AMA, "safeguards that should protect the medical schools from unwarranted interferences in their affairs by the Federal Government". So much for that argument. That's the AMA speaking, Mr. President, and if it now talks out of the other side of its mouth for no apparent reason, I say to you, Mr. President, that it now talks nonsense. Imagine the Senator from Ohio, [Mr. TAFT], "Mr. Republican" as he is called, sponsoring a bill through which the Federal Government would control State and private universities. You can't imagine it, Mr. President—nor can the American people—nor can the individual doctors of America.

Mr. President, I could but I shall not speculate as to the devious reasoning which led the lay public relations directors of the

AMA to counsel its officers to do an abrupt about face and to attack a bill to the support of which the AMA with much fanfare and publicity had publicly committed itself. I shall not guess at the advertising tie-ins, or the political tie-ins, or the future job possibilities which might have been involved. But I do want to say with all the force I can command that the reasons for this about face on the part of the AMA could have had nothing to do with the need for this bill; nothing to do with the objectives of this bill; nothing to do with the content of this bill. And they should have nothing to do with our evaluation of this bill.

And, Mr. President, one more point before I leave this altogether unpalatable but important subject. I think it is important that the Members of the Senate and the members of the press who are here today remember something that occurred in connection with this bill some 2 years ago. On August 22, 1949, the AMA top command and its public relations advisors came here to Washington in order to straighten out the thinking of our newspaper men and, through them, of the American people as regards the political and social position of the AMA. The gentlemen in the Press Gallery may remember the banquet that was served them by the AMA at the Hotel Statler that day. And when Mr. Lucey of the Scripps-Howard papers questioned them as regards this bill, Dr. Lull, secretary and general manager of the AMA, said—and I quote from a stenographic transcript of that meeting—"We appeared before Congress in favor of that bill with certain modifications. There is no doubt about it that the medical schools have to have some kind of help. They cannot continue to run under the present financial structure, most of them."

Then, gentlemen, Dr. Henderson, president-elect of the AMA, told the Nation's press, and again I quote, "That is not so much a bill to get more doctors educated; it is simply that the medical schools of this country have a very difficult time financially to get along. They cannot get the private subscriptions that they used to get and it is so much more expensive today to educate doctors than it was 10 years ago and, going back 50 years ago, there is no comparison. For instance, I know of one school that had applications for many more times more students in the freshman class than they could possibly accommodate. Well, those students pay approximately \$500 to a \$1,000 a year tuition and the very lowest that they can be educated on is \$3,500 per student. The cost of medical education has grown so in the past few years that it is almost prohibitive"—unquote.

Now, Mr. President, just one more quote from that meeting. I believe it most important because it was in reply to a newspaperman's query as to why the AMA never supported anything constructive. Heatedly denying any such allegation, Dr. Lull told the press, and again I quote exactly, "We have approved and appeared for Federal aid to medical education."

Well, gentlemen, I do not want to labor the point. I would just like to say that when the AMA supported this bill, when it wanted to look noble and unselfish and progressive in the eyes of the American people, it called together the entire press of the Nation's Capital and having offered our newspapermen a most sumptuous meal, asked them to tell the Nation that the AMA supported this bill. But, Mr. President, when in some back room in Chicago, the AMA's so-called public relations advisers decided to change the AMA's collective mind, to reverse its position, to attack this so badly needed bill—then, gentlemen, the press was not invited, there were no banquets given, the public wasn't told—the gentlemen of the press might have asked "why?" Instead of that, telegrams were sent keymen—perhaps your

personal physician or mine—and they were told to bring pressure on the Congress to defeat this bill. Gentlemen, in the names of the tens of thousands of decent doctors in America, doctors such as you know and I know, I resent this shoddy, indefensible sort of action which was taken in their names. I know we will not allow it to influence our consideration of a bill which means so very much to the welfare of this Nation and of its Armed Forces.

Now, in closing, Mr. President, let me allude to just one more argument sometimes raised against this measure: the argument that although our schools badly need the aid this bill will provide, they should seek it through voluntary contributions.

On this point I want no misunderstanding. I sincerely hope the drive for voluntary funds now being carried on by the National Fund for Medical Education under the direction of Herbert Hoover will meet with every success. I know the passage of this bill will stimulate contributions to that fund just as has been the case whenever we have made evident our recognition of a national need through the appropriation of funds for research on disease.

I am very glad to know that the AMA has contributed a half million of its own money to that fund even though I regret the fact that the AMA, which knew of this need a decade ago, waited until this bill was about to become law before it acted, and even though that contribution will not help schools of dentistry or nursing or public health.

And I am glad that the AMA is urging its members every week to individually contribute a hundred dollars a year to the support of our medical schools. But I am sorry to note that during the first 24 weeks of that campaign less than three one-hundredths of 1 percent of the country's physicians was in sufficient agreement with the AMA's position make such an individual contribution. No, gentlemen, that figure is not an error. For over 6 months the AMA appealed to its members to help solve the critical needs of our medical schools the AMA way. It asked them to do so each week during that period. On August 4, 1951, the Journal of the AMA listed the names of the doctors who had complied. They amounted not to 50 percent of our doctors, gentlemen; not to 5 percent—not to 3 percent; not even 1 percent of the physicians in this country complied. When you add up the list of those who did, you will find that it represents approximately point 003; three one-hundredths of 1 percent of the doctors of America agree with the AMA's leadership as to how that which the AMA itself calls "A Challenge to the Medical Profession" should be met.

But again I say, Mr. President, that I most sincerely hope that the efforts of the National Fund are eventually successful. I would remind you that the first brochure sent out by this excellent organization stated that, and I quote, "We therefore face the immediate necessity of finding an additional \$40,000,000 a year for the support of our medical schools," I would remind you that the fund's literature told us and again I quote, "Certainly there can be no objection to the use of Federal funds in aid of the medical schools in the face of an emergency such as exists today." The directors of the fund—and they include such men as Herbert Hoover; S. Sloan Colt, president of the Bankers Trust Co.; Samuel Leidesdorf; Winthrop Aldrich; Winthrop Rockefeller; Owen J. Roberts; and other such eminently outstanding and respectable figures—these men told us that if the Federal Government should appropriate \$40,000,000, it would leave approximately twenty-two million dollars to be raised from private sources. Well, gentlemen, the National Fund has been in existence almost 3 years since it made that announcement. Its members have worked arduously, intelligent-

ly, and at great personal cost. Yet the fund has raised—not forty millions, nor twenty-two millions a year, but slightly more than one million in 2½ years—about fifteen thousand dollars for each school; just the cost of training one student in each school.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the National Fund succeeds in its attempt to raise through voluntary contributions the money needed to support our schools of medicine. As I have told the American Legion, should it so succeed, at any time in the future, I pledge you that I will immediately move to cut out all appropriations made for medical schools under this legislation. But, Mr. President, America cannot wait. America cannot take a chance. It takes years to train a doctor. We cannot stand here today and so vote as to assure Joe Stalin that he can count on a medically unprepared America for still more years.

In closing Mr. President, let me say just this. Since 1949 when the Senate passed this bill without a single objection, our needs for physicians, dentists, nurses, and other trained health experts have risen sharply. The shortage of 1949 has become the crisis of 1951. Because we did not put into motion a Federal aid program, many of our professional schools could not even maintain their standards, let alone expand.

From shortage in 1949 to crisis in 1951—but we must not let the 1951 crisis deteriorate into the calamity of 195X. There is before us the warning of the Task Force on Federal Medical Services of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government:

"The evidence shows that medical manpower is one of the scarcest of the resources essential to the country in war. Its production cannot be increased in response to emergency demands. It cannot be stockpiled."

Among the members of that task force were: Tracy S. Voorhees, chairman; Paul R. Hawley, M. D.; William C. Menninger, M. D.; Ray Lyman Wilbur, M. D.

Against a somber background of international tension and fear, I would like to stress one further consideration that compels support for this measure: the word "emergency" in the emergency Federal aid for professional schools bill, S. 337, has a double meaning. The importance of training more doctors, dentists, and nurses to meet increased military and civil defense needs in this emergency requires no further elaboration before this body.

But I should like to stress the other meaning implicit in the use of the word "emergency" in the bill's title. Were the fear and dread of war to vanish before us tomorrow, we should still face an emergency in the ever-continuing war we wage for longer life and better health. Against diseases and crippling affliction and death, we are always outnumbered. Our physicians and dentists and nurses must always fight against overwhelming odds. The least this Congress can do is recognize that our schools must be strengthened, must have funds to train more men and women.

Passage of S. 337 can at least help the schools train new reinforcements in the battle against disease and can prevent the tragedy which might otherwise result, should our people lack for doctors, dentists, nurses, and others. I urge a favorable vote in the Senate.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS WHICH TESTIFIED ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION IN THE HEALTH PROFESSIONS

American Medical Association.
Association of American Medical Colleges.
American Council on Education (Committee on Federal Relations unanimously endorsed).

Association of Schools of Public Health.
National Association of State Universities.

Association of American Universities.
American Hospital Association.
National League of Nursing Education.
American Nurses Association.
Association of Public Health Nursing.
National Association of Public Health Nursing.

Association of Collegiate Schools of Nursing.

American Association of Industrial Nurses.
National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses.

National Association for Practical Nurse Education.

American Association of Medical Social Workers.

Catholic Hospital Association.
Association of American Medical Social Workers.

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE STAFF OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSING FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION FOR THE HEALTH PROFESSIONS

(By Lowell J. Reed, chairman)

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,
Baltimore, Md., June 24, 1949.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: In accordance with your request of June 9, 1949, I have served as moderator of a group of meetings at which representatives of educational institutions and professional and administrative organizations in the health professions discussed the details of legislative and administrative provisions that they would find acceptable in a program of Federal aid to education in medicine, dentistry, public health, and nursing. My report of these discussions and the conclusions reached is respectfully submitted herewith.

I have been charged by all those who took part in these discussions to convey to you their sincere appreciation of the opportunity you have accorded them to participate in working out the details of legislation which will be of such importance in maintaining and improving the quality of education and assuring the stability of institutions during their current financial emergency.

Sincerely yours,

LOWELL J. REED,
Vice President in Charge of Medical Affairs.

INTRODUCTION

Open hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for a week—June 6-10, 1949—giving those who wished to testify an opportunity to present their opinions on the provisions of title I of S. 1679 and title VI of S. 1581, which would establish programs of financial aid to education in the health professions. In the impressive body of testimony given by representatives of educational institutions, professional organizations and administrators in the fields of medicine, dentistry, public health, and nursing substantial agreement was expressed on the urgent needs for Federal aid to education and on the objectives of the programs outlined in both bills. It appeared from the testimony, moreover, that with relatively little adjustment of details the provisions of S. 1679 would be acceptable to the educators in the professions concerned. All witnesses were therefore asked if they could hold themselves available during the following week to discuss with the staff of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the changes which they considered necessary to insure endorsement of the bill by the organizations which they represented. All agreed.

Accordingly, during four full days, a series of working sessions with representatives of educational organizations in the respective professions discussed the specific adjustments which would assist the Senate com-

mittee in reconciling any differences of opinion on legislative and administrative details of the bill. Dr. Lowell J. Reed, vice president, Johns Hopkins University, served as chairman of the sessions. All meetings were attended by Dr. Carlyle F. Jacobsen, executive dean of the division of health sciences and services of the State University of Iowa, representing the National Association of State Universities; by Mr. William G. Reidy and Mr. Melvin W. Sneed, of the staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and by Dr. W. Palmer Dearing, Deputy Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, and selected members of his staff.

A full day—June 14—was spent on discussion of provisions for dental education, with the following participants:

Dr. Basil G. Bibbey, professor of dentistry, University of Rochester; and for Dr. Leonard Carmichael, president of Tufts College, representing the American Council on Education.

Dr. Russell W. Bunting, dean, University of Michigan Dental School.

Dr. John P. Burke, dean, Georgetown University Dental School.

Dr. J. Ben Robinson, dean, University of Maryland Dental School and Informal Committee of Deans of Dental Schools.

Two full days (June 15 and 16) were devoted to medical education, with the following participants:

Dr. Donald Anderson, secretary, council on medical education and hospitals, American Medical Association.

Dr. George Berry, associate dean, University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, Association of American Universities, and executive council, Association of American Medical Colleges.

Dr. Joseph C. Hinsey, dean, Cornell Medical School, and chairman, executive council, Association of American Medical Colleges (second day only).

Dr. Victor Johnson, director, Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research, and council on medical education and hospitals, American Medical Association.

Dr. Joseph S. Lawrence, director, Washington office, American Medical Association.

Mr. A. H. Monk, director, Training Facilities Service for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, Veterans' Administration (second day only).

Dr. William Perkins, dean, Jefferson College of Philadelphia Medical School.

Father William Rooney, professor, Catholic University.

Dr. Dean F. Smiley, secretary, Association of American Medical Colleges.

Mr. E. K. Taylor, business manager, College of Medicine, Cornell University (second day only).

Dr. Harvey Stone, council on medical education and hospitals, American Medical Association.

Dr. Herman G. Weiskotten, dean, Syracuse University College of Medicine, and chairman, council on medical education and hospitals, American Medical Association.

Mr. Albert V. Whitehall, secretary, council on Government relations, American Hospital Association.

Discussion of public health education was completed in one-half day (morning of June 17) with the following participants:

Dr. Gaylord Anderson, director, School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, and secretary, Association American Schools of Public Health.

Mr. George Brakeley, public relations consultant to Harvard University.

Dr. Thorndyke Saville, dean of engineering, New York University, and vice president, American Society for Engineering Education.

Dr. James S. Simmons, dean, School of Public Health, Harvard University, and president, Association American Schools of Public Health.

One-half day (afternoon of June 17) was given to nursing education with the following participants:

Miss Edith Beattie, executive secretary, Graduate Nurses' Association, Washington, D. C., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Mr. George Bugbee, executive director, American Hospital Association.

Miss Olwen Davies, Associate director, National Organization for Public Health Nurses, New York City, and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Miss Margaret Foley, executive secretary, Association of Catholic Schools of Nursing.

Miss Deborah Jensen, professor of nursing education, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Miss Irene Murchison, director, School of Nursing at Loretta Heights College, Loretta, Colo., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Sister Olivia, dean, School of Nursing, Catholic University, Washington, D. C., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Miss Blanche Pfefferkorn, director of department of studies, the National League of Nursing Education, New York City, and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Mr. Donald Smith, attorney, American Nurses' Association.

Mrs. Eugenia Spaulding, director, division of nursing, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Mr. Albert V. Whitehall, secretary, Council on Government Relations, American Hospital Association.

Sister Xavier, director, Mercy Hospital School of Nursing, Grand Rapids, Mich.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Even more significant than the agreement on specific provisions which the several professional groups reached is the broad area of agreement on general issues and principles. There was no intention or effort at the start of the series of meetings to try to develop a group of underlying or general principles which would apply to all professional categories but, as the meetings progressed, each group brought forward a set of prerequisites or essentials to any legislation in its particular field. The significant thing is that there was such an extraordinary degree of similarity in the general principles which were volunteered by each group in turn and which can be said, therefore, to represent agreement on fundamental considerations.

These points of agreement are so straightforward that they require no substantial elaboration or explanation.

1. There is a financial emergency in the schools which train for the health professions that requires emergency action. Pending legislative proposals are intended to deal with this emergency. The specific provisions agreed upon as interim measures are subject to the finding of further facts through an intensive study during the first 3 years of operation on which a continuing program can be predicated.

2. There is a recognized need for a definitive study of needs and costs of training for the health professions. Enough information is now available upon which to rest a sound program of emergency assistance but a continuing program will require more complete data on needs and costs. This information could be gathered and presented to the Congress within 3 years.

3. All educators agree that the principle of local support and responsibility for these training institutions is of the highest importance and that any Federal support should be provided under conditions or limitations that recognize this principle. Federal assistance should be in supplementation of existing funds and some method

should be found whereby the provision of Federal funds does not result in the withdrawal of funds from existing sources. The Federal contribution should not be more than a fixed proportion of the total institutional budget.

4. In the determination by the Federal administering authority of accredited schools eligible to receive Federal assistance use should be made of the recognized professional accrediting bodies.

5. The accrediting bodies which have been established in each of the professions should remain the principal guarantors and protectors of the quality of instruction.

6. Federal interference with faculty appointments, professional curricula, admission policies, or the internal management of the schools must be avoided.

7. There are recognized shortages of manpower in the health professions and many schools are already doing all they can to help meet these shortages in their present financial situation. Substantial expansion to meet the needs of the country cannot be expected until some financial stability for present enrollments has been achieved.

8. Existing private sources of income are not able to meet the large needs of the medical and other schools for increased operating expenses, for necessary improvements and modernization, and for expansion.

9. Scholarships will be helpful in equalizing educational opportunity for those who desire to get training in the health professions, but they ought to be awarded only to students who have previously been admitted to an accredited school.

10. Indentured service provisions are contrary to sound educational policy and also unworkable.

11. The need of the schools for construction is very great both for new space and replacement space. The inclusion of construction funds for replacement in present legislation should be addressed to efforts to relieve manpower shortages. If construction funds are provided there should be a limitation on the total Federal contribution.

12. Regulations should be established and major administrative policies determined only after obtaining the advice and recommendations of an advisory council representative of the educational institutions and health professions and of the general public.

13. The advisory council's recommendations on major matters should be reported to the Congress by the Surgeon General and the council should be given the assistance of technical committees of experts in the various fields covered by the program.

DENTAL SCHOOLS, INCLUDING SCHOOLS OF DENTAL HYGIENE

In discussing the application of S. 1679 to dental schools and to schools of dental hygiene, the conference considered a digest of the testimony which had previously been given before the subcommittee and this digest formed the basis of the discussions.

Basic grant

The several witnesses who had specifically mentioned the necessity and advisability of making a minimum operating grant to the schools of dentistry and the schools of dental hygiene, had each emphasized the huge backlog of necessary dental work in the general population, the inadequacy of the present annual graduates to approximate the number of dentists needed, the precarious financial situation of many of the present dental schools, and their need for early financial assistance. It was pointed out that many dental schools support themselves in large measure by overloading their clinics in order to augment their incomes. In these schools, the lack of a fiscal deficit is often testimony to an educational deficit resulting from overloaded teaching staff, insufficient facilities and equipment, and concentration on the revenue-producing clinic

activities. In others, there is an outright fiscal deficit.

The average cost of educating a dental student is \$1,500 per student per year; the average income from tuition and fees is nearly \$450. One-fourth of the average annual cost per student would be about \$400, as contrasted with a figure of about \$500 which represents one-fourth of the average annual costs in medical schools. While the group agreed to accept the per capita grant of \$250 per dental student proposed in S. 1679, need was expressed for a closer parity with medical schools.

A differential between the grants for medical schools and dental schools is acceptable to the dental profession only because of the acknowledged fact that the current costs of medical education are greater than the cost of dental education, because the financial situation of the medical schools is more urgent, and because of the general public acceptance of the wisdom of some differential. There was objection to such a differential on principle.

Representatives of the dental profession were anxious that Federal assistance should not be limited to schools operating on a 12-month basis. The basis for all grants should be the academic year of 36 weeks (or other definition established by the academic calendar of each institution) with authority in the proposed Council to provide by regulation for adjustments to schools which operate on other than the 9-month basis.

Incentive grant

A mere recitation of the total dental enrollments in the immediate prewar and in the immediate postwar years shows that a very considerable expansion has already taken place in the dental schools, whereas before World War II the dental schools were operating at only 75 percent capacity, all available places in the schools are now full. This is believed to be largely attributable to the effects of the GI educational bill, and it naturally causes some apprehension about what will happen to enrollments when the present legislation expires within the next few years. In any event, at present all classes are now full, and there is little likelihood of further expansion without additional construction.

The concept of a larger per capita grant for additional students was accepted by the dental representatives as a reasonable device to encourage all possible expansion. In order to prevent unreasonable expansion, without an increase of facilities, at the expense of the quality of instruction, however, there ought to be some limit. It was agreed that there should be a top limit of 10 percent of present average enrollment of each school.

Although the grant proposed in S. 1679 (namely, \$1,350) for each additional student was finally accepted as a reasonable basis by the group, one or more had expressed themselves as favoring a lesser sum, such as \$750 or one-half the average annual cost per student. Others felt that the actual incentive grant figure was not very important during the 3-year period intended to be covered by the bill, because practically all schools are at capacity at present and not very many incentive students can be added.

Scholarships

Every member of the group felt that it was important to clarify at the outset the intent or objective of the scholarship program proposed. (This necessity was also expressed by each subsequent group of witnesses.) Scholarships may have at least two purposes, namely, (1) to equalize educational opportunity or to remove the financial barrier to advanced training, or (2) to stimulate recruitment of additional numbers or a higher quality of applicants seeking advanced training.

The representatives of the dental schools emphasized that scholarships were not

needed now to induce additional students to seek admission to dental schools but that they very likely would be necessary when the GI educational benefits expired. On the understanding that scholarships for dental education were intended at this time primarily as a device to equalize educational opportunity, the dental schools accepted and endorsed a scholarship program.

There was an almost unanimous opposition to the provisions requiring a period of obligated service as repayment of a scholarship. It might be retained as an alternative if the Congress insisted, but this whole problem of the future obligation of scholarship holders should be studied at length by whatever study group might be established.

One or more of the conferees expressed the view that scholarships ought not to be so generous that they covered the entire needs of the holders. A necessity to find a portion of his total needs should remain the responsibility of all subsidized students.

Construction

The needs of the dental schools for new plant—both additional and replacement space—are very great, and there must be substantial construction before there can be appreciable expansion. Moreover, several schools are in such urgent need for improvement or replacement of their present physical plant they will either have to find ways to get such a new plant or face limiting enrollments or outright closure in the near future.

The proposed 50 percent limit on Federal contribution to any such construction was approved as sound in principle and satisfactory in proportion.

The representatives of the dental schools felt that the main emphasis in the construction provisions was rightly put on new construction and on the expansion and improvement of existing structures with reference to the extension of enrollment capacity.

Administrative provisions

There was an extended discussion of the function of the proposed National Advisory Council, and, although there was at first some discussion in favor of lodging administrative responsibilities for recommending and reviewing programs in the council, the dental schools recognized the legal responsibility of the full-time administrator and the impropriety of control by a part-time group without legal responsibility for the program. They expressed themselves as completely satisfied with the predominant advisory and consultative role but indicated that the functions of the council should be specified more clearly and that the report to Congress should detail the council's recommendations on major issues.

It was also agreed that a council of nearly 25 was too large, that it ought to be cut to perhaps 12 and that each major professional area should be represented (except dental hygiene).

With reference to the prohibition against "unreasonable discrimination" against out-of-State students, there was some discussion around the danger of rigidity or of possibly requiring State institutions to do more than they could. The expectancy that, with Federal assistance, the schools should serve more than a purely local function was readily accepted by the schools, but there was some apprehension lest regulations might require a rigid figure or percentage of out-of-State students for all schools. There were no specific suggestions for appropriate safeguards.

Survey

The representatives of the dental schools readily agreed that a careful and thoughtful study of the areas covered by the bills was urgently needed. They made no specific recommendation on what agency should make the study, nor how it should be conducted. The discussion included reference to the likelihood that issues of dental needs and serv-

ices beyond the scope of the study required by present title I of S. 1679 would surely arise—an issue which was discussed at great length and clarified with representatives of the medical schools and professions (see below)—and it was felt by several that an independent commission should be created for any such task. On the other hand, it was recognized that there was real advantage in having the study of the costs and needs of schools carried on by the operating agency had real merit.

Schools of dental hygiene

The representatives of the dental schools felt that there was urgent need for training additional numbers of dental hygienists and that the training facilities in the country should be very considerably expanded. In general, the present provisions of title I of S. 1679 were believed to be wholly satisfactory, except that there was little need to have them represented on the proposed council; their interests were said to be adequately represented by dental members. There was general agreement on the lack of adequate information on the required curricula, and some apprehension was expressed over the need for suitable licensing legislation in several States and for an accrediting body to set standards.

Participants: Dr. Basil G. Bibbey, professor of dentistry, University of Rochester, and for Dr. Leonard Carmichael, president of Tufts College, representing the American Council on Education; Dr. Russell W. Bunting, dean, University of Michigan Dental School; Dr. John P. Burke, dean, Georgetown University Dental School; Dr. J. Ben Robinson, dean, University of Maryland Dental School, and Informal Committee of Deans of Dental Schools.

MEDICAL SCHOOLS

In discussing the application of title I of S. 1679 to medical schools, the conference began by considering a brief digest of the testimony which had been given before the subcommittee in formal hearings. Each group was asked whether they had any general comment on the problems or further comments on the testimony previously given. The digest was accepted as a working basis for the sessions.

Basic grant

The justification for a basic grant to provide emergency financial assistance at this time is the necessity of maintaining enrollment and restoring and maintaining the quality of medical education in order to provide a sound base for expansion. This quality has deteriorated because of (1) the loss of approximately one-third of total income during the depression, (2) the effort to increase output during the war and the failure to develop adequate numbers of young teachers during that time, and (3) the postwar inflation which has cut endowment income to one-half its 1932 value.

To meet the needs of medical schools as presented by the deans, an amount ranging between \$100,000 and \$200,000 per school would be needed. Financial assistance on a per capita enrollment basis was readily accepted as a satisfactory method, but it was agreed that \$300 per student per year was too low. The group agreed on not less than \$500 per student per year. This is the minimum per capita sum necessary to do the emergency job. It will provide the medical schools with \$11,500,000 to meet known needs of between \$10,000,000 and \$15,000,000. It would be between 20 and 25 percent of the average cost per student and would be about half the average annual cost of the poorest schools (which need help most).

All conferees agreed that there should be a ceiling on the Federal proportion of a medical school budget. The deans and the representatives of the universities and of the Public Health Service felt that Federal aid

should represent as much as 50 percent in order to prevent reducing the basic per capita grant to the poorest schools. The American Medical Association, on philosophic grounds, felt that no school should get more than 30 percent of its income from Federal funds. Incident to this discussion, some conflict of principle arose in the desire to retain the maximum amount of responsibility for local support (keeping the Federal proportion of school budgets at the lowest possible figure) and the desire to avoid an extensive Federal audit of medical school costs which would be necessary if the Federal grant approximated the ceiling (30 percent or 50 percent) fixed in the act. The deans and university representatives who would have the problem of meeting the requirements of the detailed audit which any ceiling based on proportion of total costs would entail, stated that they had no fear of such audit, but believed that even the 50 percent ceiling would be approached by only a very few schools, i. e., those at the lower end of the scale in financial resources. The representatives of the American Medical Association, on the other hand, held the position that no matter how meager those resources from community or other private support, each school should raise 70 percent of its income from non-Federal sources.

A representative of the Veterans' Administration helped the group clarify its thinking on university cost accounting and Federal auditing of such costs by explaining the administration of the law covering GI educational benefits and the practices of the schools.

The final majority agreement was that the basic grant should not replace other income, should be \$500 per student, and should not be more than 50 percent of the costs of instruction as reported to the Surgeon General, rather than as determined by the Surgeon General.

It was also agreed that nothing in the present bill should affect the existing teaching grants of the Public Health Service—in cancer and mental disease—or the authorized teaching grants—in heart and other diseases—to the schools.

With respect to the basis of calculating the school enrollment, it was agreed that the school would get \$500 per student per academic year in effect in the school and that in counting enrollment only full-time candidates for the doctor of medicine degree would be included. All graduate students in medicine, interns, and residents should be excluded, but the problems of including graduate medical education should be included in the study proposed in subsequent discussions.

Incentive grant

The \$1,700 sum proposed for each additional student in S. 1679 was regarded as excessive and a dangerous bait to overexpansion. The conference agreed that \$1,000 per additional student would strike at approximately the right level; it would give some encouragement to expansion in those schools which could accept more students and yet it would not be large enough to be a dangerous incentive.

Even with the \$1,000 per additional student, it was felt that there should be some upper limit beyond which the Federal Government ought not to pay for additional students. The medical educators accepted the formula which had been proposed by the dental representatives, namely, that no school should be permitted to receive an incentive grant for more than 10 percent of the enrollment in any one class.

The lowering of the incentive grant to \$1,000 and the imposition of the 10-percent limit was justified not only as a damper on unsound expansion but in recognition that the schools are already doing everything possible to respond to the public pressure for more physicians. The provision of the basic

grant of \$500 per student per year was regarded as an equally important incentive to expansion, because it gives some assurance of financial stability to the schools.

It was the consensus of the group that the proposed \$850 per student per year for new schools was too high; the figure was defended as being only a rough estimate of the margin of cost of a new school over an established one. There was agreement that a fair adjustment would be for new schools to receive the basic grant of \$500 per student up to 90 percent of the enrollment and the incentive grant of \$1,000 for the remaining 10 percent of the enrollment.

Scholarships

A scholarship program is not needed at this time to stimulate additional applicants for medical education. The schools now receive several times the number of qualified applicants who can be admitted. Most medical schools now have limited funds for both loans and scholarships with which to help worthy students, especially to keep good students from dropping out of school for financial reasons. It is not known how many good students fail to apply to the medical schools because they have no prospect of being able to meet the substantial costs.

There was some discussion of the importance of holding off on scholarships for medical education until there was a broad scholarship program for all higher education but it was agreed that, because scholarships are an important part of the total program for some other of the health professions, particularly public health and nursing, scholarships for medical education ought also to be included. In including them, however, it should be clear that the primary purpose is to equalize educational opportunity and to remove any financial barrier against entering the field of medical education.

The deans and educators who indicated that they had had some experience with scholarships urge that some thought be given to (1) a combination of loans and scholarships, whereby loans up to \$2,000 or \$2,500 per student could be made interest-free through 2 or 3 years after graduation, and (2) the size of the scholarship, which ought not to be so large that it covered the entire needs of the holder. A responsibility to find part of his support elsewhere should rest on the student.

Some preference was expressed for provisions which would make scholarships available to the schools for their administration.

All conferees were in full agreement (1) that scholarships ought to be awarded only to students who had already been admitted to an approved medical school, and (2) that indentured service as a repayment for scholarships was wrong in principle.

Construction grants

The deans and other representatives of educational institutions considered that some provision for construction grants was needed now in order to start planning for the necessary long-range expansion, and to give a basis of experience with Federal aid for construction for observation while construction needs are being studied. They recognized that the construction needs of the schools are so very great, both for new and replacement space, that any prospective appropriation would be only a small fraction of the total needed, that it is not likely that it would ever be possible to help all schools at one time, and, especially, that further delay would unjustifiably put off getting even a small start.

Representatives of the American Medical Association recommended the elimination of any provision for construction grants until after the completion of the study of the need for expansion and the plant needs of the schools. They admitted, however, that many schools have very considerable building and fund-raising programs in progress

and have detailed plans ready. Other schools have only general plans in mind and some have specifically held back the development of capital-fund programs until there were assurances of operating funds for the present plant.

The actual amounts needed by the Nation's medical schools is not known. Rough estimates last summer indicated that nearly \$200,000,000 in capital funds was needed by 55 schools; if the needs of the remaining schools are included by projection, the total may well exceed \$300,000,000.

Any program providing for construction grants should include matching provisions which would limit the Federal proportion to approximately 50 percent. In any construction program the funds should be available for reconstruction and remodeling of existing structures as well as for new construction when such reconstruction and remodeling is essential to the maintenance of quality or expansion.

There was general satisfaction with the proposed ordering of projects in accordance with the contribution which each proposed project would make toward meeting the personnel shortages (i. e. toward increased enrollment).

Administrative provisions

The mechanism and conditions of administration of the proposed bill caused considerable discussion. In general, the representatives of the American Medical Association desired to increase both the powers and the independence of the council with a view to limiting a presumed potential power of the Surgeon General to influence medical education. Generally, the deans and other educators with a background of long-established relations with the Federal Government, showed no such apprehension. They were willing, however, to accept some of the changes proposed.

With respect to the size and membership of the council, it was agreed that a council of 20 members was too large and probably be unwieldy and that it should be reduced to 12 members. All Federal officials were to be excluded from full voting membership on the council was to be empowered to elect its own chairman. The Surgeon General and the Commissioner of Education were to be ex-officio, nonvoting members; the other Federal officials (representing the Veterans' Administration and the Department of National Defense) were to be dropped from membership but were to be invited to meetings of the council for information and liaison purposes. None of the council members should be full-time employees of the Federal Government.

The participants agreed that at least 6 of the 12 Council members should represent the professions covered by the program. In order to avoid asking a single member of the Council to represent an entire professional field (such as medicine), considerable emphasis was placed on giving each such member a sizable technical committee from the profession to back him up and advise him on technical matters. The language authorizing the creation of special and technical committees should be made mandatory instead of permissive.

It was agreed that the role of the Council would be strengthened without diluting the strict responsibility of the Surgeon General by requiring that regulations might be promulgated only "after obtaining the advice and recommendation of the Council." This language was believed to be stronger than "after consultation" as now written.

Although it was not proposed that some express provision be written into the statute, it was understood that the Council would have authority to initiate recommendations as well as receive them. Moreover, the advice and recommendations of the Council, together with the action taken by the Surgeon General on each, should be reported

by the Surgeon General to the Congress so that the Congress would know what advice was given and the extent to which it was accepted.

Considerable discussion of the alleged power that might be exercised by the Surgeon General if he were the sole authority to determine which schools were accredited and eligible for Federal funds led to a recommendation that the statute should specifically require use of a recognized accrediting body or bodies, and that approval of such bodies would be effected by the Surgeon General only after obtaining the advice and recommendation of the Council.

Survey

The deans and representatives of the Association of American Medical Colleges, the Association of American Universities, and the National Association of State Universities, and the Public Health Service strongly stressed their conviction that the conduct of such a study not only was an appropriate function of the Council set up by the bill, but also would be most effective if conducted by or under the auspices of that Council. Special and frequent references were made to the effectiveness of the present study of the impact of Public Health Service grants on medical schools which is being conducted by a special committee established by the Surgeon General on recommendation of the National Advisory Health Council. That study might appropriately serve as a pattern for the study proposed by the bill. The representatives of the American Medical Association, however, proposed that the study be made by a committee appointed by the President or Congress, completely independent of the Federal Security Agency and the Public Health Service. They advocated a study group patterned after the Hoover Commission, which has surveyed and recommended changes in the organization of the executive departments. The majority of the participants, however, were in favor of a study under the Council.

The discussion of this study and the kind of agency that should conduct it brought out the fact that the apparent conflict of opinion resulted from some confusion of thought regarding the scope of the study. The American Medical Association felt that a study such as contemplated by part A of title VI of S. 1581 would inescapably get into highly controversial areas, such as the Nation's need for physicians, the care and services available, the method of purchasing such care, etc., and that only a completely independent commission could hope to have wide public acceptance of its findings. The deans and other educators, however, insisted that such a comprehensive study would not be necessary to the purposes of this act nor appropriate to the scope of recommended changes in this bill. Furthermore, they asserted, the objectives of any study of educational costs and needs would be totally obscured if tied in with a broad study of all health problems. It was agreed, therefore, that the study proposed in this bill should be limited in scope to remove any fear of having its purposes obscured. An appropriate charge to the study would be "to review the operation of this act and determine to what extent and in what form further support of medical education by the Federal Government should be furnished in order to provide adequately for the health of the people." It was agreed that the bill would be acceptable if changed in accordance with this suggestion.

It was suggested that the broader problem of investigating the Nation's long-range needs for medical personnel in terms of types of services required by the population, the methods of providing and of financing such services, and the facilities required rested upon a different set of considerations. If it should be decided that such a study should

be undertaken, it might well be the responsibility of a separate commission of the type proposed in S. 1581, set up under a separate act. That act might alternatively authorize the National Council on Education in the Health Professions to undertake the separate study through an additional committee patterned after that which is conducting the study of the effect of Public Health Service grants on medical schools.

Participants: Dr. Donald Anderson, secretary, council on medical education and hospitals, American Medical Association; Dr. George Berry, associate dean, University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, Association of American Universities, and executive council, Association of American Medical Colleges; Dr. Joseph C. Hinsey, dean, Cornell Medical School, and chairman, executive council, Association of American Medical Colleges (second day only); Dr. Victor Johnson, director, Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research, and council on medical education and hospitals, American Medical Association; Dr. Joseph S. Lawrence, director, Washington office, American Medical Association; Mr. A. H. Monk, director, Training Facilities Service for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, Veterans' Administration (second day only); Dr. William Perkins, dean, Jefferson College of Philadelphia Medical School; Father William Rooney, professor, Catholic University; Dr. Dean F. Smiley, secretary, Association American Medical Colleges; Mr. E. K. Taylor, business manager, College of Medicine, Cornell University (second day only); Dr. Harvey Stone, council on medical education and hospitals, American Medical Association; Dr. Herman G. Weiskotten, dean, Syracuse University College of Medicine, and chairman, council on medical education and hospitals, American Medical Association; Mr. Albert V. Whitehall, secretary, council on government relations, American Hospital Association.

SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH

The conference briefly reviewed a digest of the testimony which had previously been given before the subcommittee and decided to use it as a basis for the discussion of the application of title I of S. 1679 to schools of public health.

Basic grant

The conference agreed that there was an urgent need for Federal financial assistance to the schools of public health. Several schools reported very considerable operating deficits this year. To meet this need the schools of public health had suggested a formula similar to that contained in S. 1679 except that it provided for a block grant amounting to one-half of the basic cost of operating the accredited program of the schools in addition to the per capita grants. The block grant has the advantage of providing a basic support for the schools regardless of differentials or fluctuations in student enrollment. In order to make the formula uniform for all professional schools to receive aid under S. 1679, however, the conferees agreed to drop the formula proposed by the schools of public health and retain the formula in the bill, provided the per capita grants set forth in the bill were raised to an adequate amount.

The schools of public health suggested that the basic per capita grant should be \$1,200 instead of the \$350 provided in S. 1679. The justification for the higher amount is that it costs approximately \$4,500 per graduate student per year for training in a school of public health. The reasons for the higher costs for public health are outlined in the testimony of the schools. It was emphasized that a basic grant of \$1,200 would not enable the schools to increase their enrollment, in fact even \$1,200 would not overcome current annual per capita deficits in some of the schools. An incentive grant of at least double that amount would be

needed to meet the great increase in enrollment in the schools of public health necessary to meet the Nation's need for more trained public health workers.

It was noted that the schools of public health were asking that the Federal Government contribute as a basic per capita grant about one-fourth of the cost of training a graduate student in a school of public health. This is the same proportion of Federal assistance to total costs as was requested by the medical schools.

The suggestion was made that a limitation be inserted which would prevent Federal funds becoming a substitute for other university funds since university authorities are not anxious for Federal assistance which will discourage or impair State appropriations, endowment drives, and other independent sources of income. The group agreed that such a limitation should not be inserted in the bill but that it should be a statement of intent or a guide to Federal and university officials administering the program.

If the basic per capita grant for medical schools were raised to \$500, as had been suggested by the conferees on aid to medical schools, then a basic grant of \$1,200 would not be a disproportionate (in terms of costs) figure for schools of public health. Actually application of the same ratio would result in a figure of about \$1,000 basic per capita grant for the schools of public health. The conferees agreed to the application of the same ratio (one-fourth Federal funds to three-fourths non-Federal funds) for all professional schools to be aided under S. 1679. This would mean a basic per capita grant of \$1,000 for the schools of public health. The schools accepted this with the proviso that it be recognized that \$1,000 is too low a figure to overcome current cost per student deficits in the schools of public health.

Incentive grant

The suggestion was made that the incentive grant be limited in order to safeguard quality of instruction in the schools of public health. This suggestion had previously been made during the conferences on aid to medical and dental schools, and the schools of public health agreed to the 10-percent limitation those two groups had recommended.

The group agreed that the incentive grant for the schools of public health should be in the same proportion (double) to the basic grant as in the case of the medical schools. It was agreed, therefore, that a basic per capita grant of \$1,000 and an incentive grant of \$2,000 would be acceptable, provided it was recognized that these figures were inadequate to meet either current operating deficits or costs of needed expansion; it was recorded that the schools of public health believed these figures should be \$1,200 and \$2,400 satisfactorily to meet their needs. In effect, therefore, the conferees agreed to the principle that the basic grant should be one-fourth of the total cost of training a graduate student and that the incentive grant should be one-half that cost.

Scholarships

The conferees agreed that a scholarship provision for schools of public health should be retained in the bill. Two modifications were suggested: (1) A higher stipend and (2) a provision for assistance for field training programs.

It was agreed that the amount of the scholarship stipend should be omitted from the bill and left to determination by the council. It was also agreed that because field training was not now very well organized and because of the emergency nature of the bill a provision for aid to field training programs should not be inserted. The group believed, however, that field training should be included in the study authorized in the bill.

Construction grants

The group agreed that construction grant provisions should be retained in the bill. In fact, construction grant provisions were thought by some to be the most important provisions of the bill, at least so far as private institutions were concerned. The schools of public health agreed that the construction aid provision should be given a higher priority than the scholarship provision.

The group agreed that the preamble of the bill should state that only minimum necessary funds for current operations and for expansion of facilities should be authorized.

The matter of standards to be applied in the allotment of funds for construction aid were discussed at some length. The group concluded that such standards should be left to regulations implementing the construction provisions in the bill.

Administrative provisions

The group generally agreed with the recommendations of the medical schools with respect to the administrative provisions, but accepted the suggestion that the only change to be incorporated in the bill was that requiring the appointment of technical subcommittees to the council.

A question was raised with respect to the proper definition of a school of public health as well as how schools of public health became accredited. The schools of public health agreed to the suggestion made previously by the medical schools that S. 1679 should be changed to provide that the accrediting body would be approved by the Surgeon General after obtaining the advice and recommendation of the National Council on Education for Health Professions. The accreditation program for schools of public health carried on by the American Public Health Association was described.

Survey

The group discussed the suggestion that the study authorized in the bill should be a comprehensive Hoover Commission type of study that would be completely independent and delve into nearly all aspects of the Nation's health needs. The group agreed at the end of this discussion that it would prefer that the council organize and direct the study and that it be limited to a study of the education of health personnel. As a second choice the conferees agreed that the study not be directed by the council but simply made under its auspices.

Other comments

The schools of public health stated that they had no fear of possible infringement of their freedom and integrity if title I of S. 1679 were to become law.

The schools of engineering reported that the Association of Engineering Colleges favored the bill but suggested that aid to engineering be limited to graduate students of sanitary engineering. The group endorsed this suggestion.

Participants: Dr. Gaylord Anderson, director, School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, and secretary, Association American Schools of Public Health; Mr. George Brakeley, public-relations consultant to Harvard University; Dr. Thorndyke Saville, dean of engineering, New York University, and vice president, American Society for Engineering Education; Dr. James S. Simmons, dean, School of Public Health, Harvard University, and president, Association American Schools of Public Health.

NURSING SCHOOLS

The American Nurses' Association had submitted as part of its testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Health specific and detailed information regarding title I of S. 1679. The most important of these recommendations, together with recommendations regarding Federal aid to schools of nursing made by the American Hospital

Association and the Catholic Hospital Association, had been summarized, and this material was used as an agenda for the meeting.

Before starting on the agenda, the group was asked by the chairman for any general comments that they might have. The American Nurses Association referred to their recommendation regarding nondiscrimination of either sex. It was agreed by all present that the intent of the bill was that there should be no discrimination against sex and that they had felt it was not necessary to specifically state this fact in the bill. The American Nurses' Association pointed out that men nurses were concerned and that their fears would be allayed if the bill specifically stated that there would be no discrimination against sex as well as no discrimination against race, creed, color, or national origin. The group agreed that this could be done.

The very large enrollment in schools of nursing under the Cadet Nurse Corps wartime program raises a problem regarding the years which should be used for calculating the average past enrollment. It was agreed by the conferees that the Surgeon General after obtaining the advice and recommendations of the council should make this determination.

The American Nurses' Association recommended that consideration be given to aid for the education of other workers such as dietitians and medical librarians. It was suggested that it would be better to postpone aid to other groups until after the contemplated 3-year study is completed.

The group then proceeded to consider the agenda.

DEGREE SCHOOLS

Definition

There are a number of hospital schools of nursing with varying types of affiliation with colleges in addition to the degree programs in nursing. For this reason it was felt both by the American Hospital Association and the American Nurses' Association that a clearer definition of the degree school was needed. The latter recommended that the following wording be used in place of the present language referring to degree programs:

"To each university- or college-controlled school of nursing that provides basic or advanced training in nursing for which it grants a baccalaureate or higher degree."

The group agreed that this would clarify the meaning of this section.

There was some discussion as to whether any further definition should be included in the bill. The nursing representatives pointed out that the nursing profession has developed a definition of a basic degree program and has criteria for judging whether a school fits this definition. They are, therefore, in a position to advise the Surgeon General which schools would be eligible for grants under this section. It was agreed not to include any more specific definition of a degree program than that recommended above.

Basic grant

The need for financial aid in university schools of nursing offering both basic and advanced programs is very great at the present time. No one has questioned the need for more nurses prepared in these programs and for more nurses with advanced and special preparation. Cost of education in these programs is high because of the requirement for clinical practice fields and individual type supervision during the clinical practice period.

Financial assistance on a per capita enrollment basis was accepted as a satisfactory method and the American Nurses' Association agreed to the amount of the grant for each student enrolled up to the average past enrollment. It was initially agreed that the

sum of \$200 per student per annum is probably an acceptable amount. However, when it was learned subsequently that the other groups had adopted a formula by which the basic grant was doubled in the incentive grant, it was decided to change the recommendation from \$200 to \$300 per student per annum.

Incentive grant

There is need for an incentive grant for these schools in order to assist them to expand their practice fields, to increase their teaching staff, and to offer salaries commensurate with other university salaries so that they can attract well-prepared teaching staffs. However, both the American Hospital Association and the American Nurses' Association thought that \$1,200 was too large. The latter initially recommended that this amount be reduced to \$750 per student; subsequently the recommendation was changed and the group agreed that the incentive grant should be \$600 per student per annum.

The chairman reported that the medical group had recommended that the incentive grant be allowed for only an increase of 10 percent of past enrollment. Any increase over that would receive the basic amount. There was considerable discussion of this question and all seemed agreed that this restriction would be unwise if applied to degree schools of nursing. Many university schools are very small and need to enlarge to utilize funds most efficiently and diploma schools may become university schools which would produce an immediate large increase.

Scholarships

A scholarship program is very much needed in nursing as recruitment is one of the problems in obtaining enough students in the university schools of nursing. There are very few scholarships available from private sources, and students because of financial need sometimes choose a less good school of nursing where there are small tuition fees in preference to a university school.

The American Nurses' Association recommended that scholarship funds should be given directly to the schools instead of through a State agency. No decision was reached, but it seemed that the committee preferred the method of giving scholarship funds through a State agency as outlined in the bill. Discussion brought out the fact that some States did not wish Federal aid. Students in these States would be penalized. They might go to another State to apply but would be at a disadvantage. The conclusion seemed to be that this inequity could not be avoided.

The American Nurses' Association recommended that the requirement that a student receiving a scholarship give service in Government service or areas of shortage be changed to require merely agreement to continue "in the practice of his profession with respect to which said scholarship was granted." Specifically the recommendation reads as follows:

"(b) Agreement by the appointee to serve upon completion of his training (including internships and residencies) in the practice of his profession with respect to which such scholarship was granted, 1 year for each two academic years during which he received the benefits of the scholarship."

Medical science and nursing practice are advancing so rapidly that it is difficult for a person employed outside the large educational centers to keep up to date. It is very important, if our Nation is to continue to get the best health care, that nurses take "refresher" training from time to time. Scholarship aid is needed for this type of training as nursing salaries are still too low to permit the nurse to save for additional study. The American Nurses' Association recommended that scholarship aid for "re-

fresher" courses be included in the bill. The question was not fully discussed by the group and no decision was reached.

Construction grants

The chairman asked the group whether they supported funds for construction. There was no discussion on this point, but there was a unanimous agreement that this would be an essential part of the program if the number of nurses was to be increased.

DIPLOMA SCHOOLS

Definition and eligibility for Federal aid

The American Hospital Association recommended that the bill specify that State licensing bodies should be the "approving or accrediting bodies to be selected by the Surgeon General." The American Nurses' Association wished the language of the bill to remain just as it is. They stated there is now a National Nursing Accrediting Service which, though recently formed, is taking over several services which are well-established and have been accrediting for years (National Organization for Public Health Nursing, Association of Collegiate Schools of Nursing, and the National League of Nursing Education). The first-named has approved all the programs in public health nursing in this country which meet their criteria for approval. The last-named has accredited only about (150) 12 percent of the schools, but is experienced in method). The nursing profession is ready to assume the responsibility and does not think it should be treated in this regard differently from the other professions, that is, it wishes the Surgeon General with the advice of the Council to select the approving body or bodies.

The American Hospital Association does not agree that the nursing profession is sufficiently experienced to be used as the accrediting body though they know the work being done at present. They think in view of the fact that hospitals own and administer almost all the diploma schools they should have a voice in which ones to receive Federal aid. They are fearful that too many schools will be closed by the nursing profession. It was pointed out that lack of Federal aid in itself should not close a school and it is known that the schools which did not receive Cadet Nurse Corps funds continued to operate. The American Hospital Association was concerned lest patient care should be neglected in the effort to raise nursing standards.

Figures were given regarding the number of schools in the country and the number of students enrolled. While the number of schools has been steadily decreasing the number of students has been increasing. This would indicate that more nurses could and would be produced even if the poorest schools closed.

It was suggested that a hospital administrator be specified as a member of the Council and also that the subcommittee have hospital administrator representation on it. The American Nurses' Association agreed that this would be desirable and, even if it were not specified in the bill, hospital administrators would certainly be included in the subcommittee on nursing as they had been in the past.

The group agreed that if the composition of the council and the subcommittee on nursing was changed as indicated, the language of the bill regarding the approving or accrediting bodies would not be changed for nursing.

Basis for Federal aid

The American Nurses' Association recommended that the same basis be used for diploma schools as for degree schools but with different amounts for basic and incentive grants. They recommended that \$150 per annum be granted for each student en-

rolled equal to the average past enrollment and that \$400 per annum be granted for each student in excess of average past enrollment.

There was considerable discussion of this proposal and the provision as now written in the bill. However, the points of agreement and disagreement were not clearly defined. Representatives of the nursing group, the American Hospital Association and Catholic Hospital Association were asked to get together later and work out some solution.

Suggested solutions

The conferees initially recommended that section 372 (3) B should be replaced by a provision that each school which provides basic training leading to a diploma in nursing shall receive \$250 for each student enrolled in the first year; \$100 for each student enrolled in the second year; \$50 for each student enrolled in the third year. Not less than 50 percent of this grant should be used in lieu of student tuition, fees, etc. (i. e., student payment for tuition, fees, book facilities services; board and lodging must be waived up to at least one-half the amount of the Federal grant for the 3-year period). This would provide in some schools full scholarship to all students, in other schools it would mean waiving part of the charges for all students or all the charges for a few students. No school would lose money by participation in the program, as a few would have under the provision as now written in the bill. All schools would have some funds to be used to improve the program, as the total Federal grant would not merely substitute for previously received tuition and when these proposals were declared unworkable, the conferees subsequently agreed that the American Nurses' Association's original recommendation be adopted, namely \$150 as a basic grant per student, with \$300 as the incentive grant. The conferees strongly advocated that the following provision for scholarship aid be included:

"The funds allotted under this section shall be used for instructional costs and scholarship aid, the scholarship aid to approximate 50 percent of the total allotment."

It was recognized by all concerned that doubling the basic amount for the incentive grant might not be wise in diploma schools of nursing; since each additional student gives additional service to the hospital, the same degree of monetary incentive did not seem necessary or perhaps even desirable.

Practical nursing

Both the American Hospital Association and the Catholic Hospital Association expressed strong objection to having Federal aid limited to public educational institutions. At the present time more than half of the approved schools are operated by private institutions, mainly hospitals. The opinion was expressed that there is no evidence at present that vocational high schools can do the training job better or even as well and that all the funds should not be given to aid this type of practical nurse-education program.

It was pointed out that private institutions could be used for clinical practice and were now being so used. The bill, furthermore, could be amended to provide for contract arrangements with private institutions for conducting the entire course of training.

The American Hospital Association and Catholic Hospital Association did not feel this would be satisfactory as some States prohibit such arrangements and others would not use it freely. Since there was insufficient time to discuss this matter thoroughly, it was discussed later by a smaller group. Additional statements were made to support the view that Federal aid should be given to both private and public institutions. The group agreed that they would prefer to have the Public Health Service administer the money, granting it to individ-

ual schools and institutions in the same manner as for other groups in the bill. Part of the money should be given by the Public Health Service to the Office of Education for expansion of the practical nurse program as provided in part B.

It was agreed that Federal aid is definitely needed for this program but the present provisions would be strongly opposed.

Administrative provisions

The chairman presented the recommendations regarding the composition and functions of the health council which had been made by the medical group meeting earlier in the week. These recommendations were accepted by this group and, in view of the changes proposed, the American Nurses' Association withdrew its previous recommendations that three members of the council should represent nursing.

The American Nurses' Association recommended that provision be made for the establishment of a State advisory committee for each of the fields which would advise the State agency in the formulation of a plan and assist in the selection of appointees for scholarships. Apparently this recommendation was acceptable to all but no definite decision was reached.

A special subcommittee should be established with adequate representation of hospital administrators and the nursing profession to advise the council with respect to the body or bodies which should be utilized to approve or accredit the diploma schools of nursing eligible for Federal aid.

Participants: Miss Edith Beattie, executive secretary, Graduate Nurses' Association, Washington, D. C., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association; Mr. George Bugbee, executive director, American Hospital Association; Miss Olwen Davies, associate director, National Organization for Public Health Nurses, New York City, and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association; Miss Margaret Foley, executive secretary, Association of Catholic Schools of Nursing; Miss Deborah Jensen, professor of nursing education, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association; Miss Irene Murchison, director, School of Nursing at Loretta Heights College, Loretta, Colo., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association; Sister Olivia, dean, School of Nursing, Catholic University, Washington, D. C., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association; Miss Blanche Pfefferkorn, director of Department of Studies, the National League of Nursing Education, New York City, and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association; Mr. Donald Smith, attorney, American Nurses' Association; Mrs. Eugenia Spaulding, director, Division of Nursing, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association; Mr. Albert V. Whitehall, secretary, Council on Government Relations, American Hospital Association; Sister Xavier, director, Mercy Hospital School of Nursing, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I should like to add, if I may, that I also consider the bill a very important measure. It is something which we cannot afford to overlook. I hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, few measures come before the Senate which hold forth such promise for the health and life of the American people as S. 337, the Emergency Professional Health Training Act of 1951. This bipartisan measure can help break the bottlenecks in medical education that now confront us.

As we meet the challenge of Communist aggression, the health of every

American family takes on ever greater significances. A sick nation cannot man production lines. A hurt people cannot solve with vigor and determination the crises that confront us.

But physicians, dentists, and nurses cannot be stockpiled. Neither do they roll off assembly lines in a few months time. The tooling-up process takes many years. Meanwhile, each passing month aggravates the danger that we shall not have enough doctors to take care of ourselves—our families here at home and our sons in the Armed Forces.

There is scarcely a family in the Nation which is not conscious of the problem. From daily experience, the American people know how harried is the average physician. Many of us have waited in crowded offices for the doctor or the dentist. In some communities, people must travel many, many miles to get professional medical aid. But it is only when these individual cases are translated in national terms that the full extent of our medical crisis appears. Here are the figures submitted by the Nation's foremost professional experts:

Physicians: The Nation needs between 15,000 and 22,000 more doctors. The former figure was submitted by officers of the American Medical Association several years ago. It is a pre-Korea figure. The higher estimate was compiled this year by the Medical Resources Advisory Committee of the National Security Resources Board, headed by Dr. Howard Rusk. Whatever the exact figure, there is general agreement that the deficit must be reckoned in the thousands if not in the tens of thousands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an excellent article entitled "Dr. Rusk Asks Rise in Physician Total," written by George Eckel, published in the New York Times of February 13, 1951.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, with respect to dentists, we are short at least 9,200 dentists, according to the Medical Resources Advisory Committee. The American Dental Association has devoted much time and energy to calling attention to the need of the dental schools for financial aid if this gap is to be closed.

As to nurses, the shortage is so acute that the major professional nursing associations have taken the lead in publicizing the urgency for national action. The shortage figure agreed to by the six professional nursing organizations is 65,000 for civilian needs alone. The Armed Forces require additional thousands of nurses. All of us should pay tribute to the public-spirited efforts of the nursing profession to arouse the country to this need.

For each section of the American community these shortages of doctors, dentists, and nurses spell needless suffering. Rural areas, for example, have long been pinched for doctors and have measurable poorer health than city dwellers. Unless the American people can now help provide the financial aid our medical schools need in order to maintain

and expand their facilities, rural people will get even fewer replacements in the future than they have in the past for the country doctors who will soon retire.

Nor is the number of physicians in our cities by any means sufficient. In many cities defense plant expansion is attracting additional thousands of workers and their families. The influx is already overtaxing strained medical facilities. The National Fund for Medical Education, headed by Herbert Hoover, points out that, because of this shortage "in at least one wide, new area of medicine—industrial medicine—the enormous gains in recent years will be minimized, if not entirely nullified."

Bernard Baruch tells us, "I think we should have had expanded medical training 4, 5, 6 years ago."

Our veterans also are being hurt by the doctor shortage. The American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, the Jewish War Veterans, the American Veterans Committee, and other groups have warned us that the equivalent of approximately 16 veterans' hospitals have been closed down for lack of medical personnel. Medical authorities point out that 4,000 beds in VA hospitals are unavailable because of shortage of trained personnel. How long can we continue to snatch doctors from VA hospitals, where they are caring for the wounded of the last war, and send them off to care for the wounded in Korea or any other area threatened by Communist imperialism? Surely we must see to it that replacements are trained.

A shortage of thousands of doctors for civilian purposes means cutting down the availability of medical care for millions of people. It means that civil defense needs go unmet. It means that public health measures cannot be taken. It means not only setbacks to the recent development of industrial medicine, but incalculable harm to the new and rewarding field of rehabilitation work. A shortage of medical personnel during this mixed cold and hot war is already a serious national problem. If the war should become an all-out hot war, this problem could become a terrifying national catastrophe.

I urge the Senate not to gloss over the warnings which have been given to us by the National Security Resources Board. I shall quote from the Board:

An enemy attack on American cities using new technological weapons might introduce some new medical and health problems from such effects as radiation and chemical and bacteriological contamination.

But, continues the report—

Granted a few minutes warning, casualties could be reduced by over 50 percent through proper organization and training in civil defense. Thorough organization will be necessary to provide adequate professional and technical personnel; and also the supplies, hospitals, and related facilities for the care of the many thousands of casualties which could occur among the civil inhabitants of a large city.

Thus national-defense requirements place both a heavy immediate additional burden on our already heavily loaded doctors, and a potential burden the size of which no man can foresee. Further we cannot solve the present problem by

stripping family doctors from inland communities and sending them to defense centers. Not a single responsible person who has ever discussed this problem has suggested that we should ration doctors—ordering them to shortage areas, herding them here or there as new emergencies develop.

Nor can we meet these great needs by juggling statistics. For example, it does not answer the problem to proclaim that the United States has more doctors in proportion to population than any other great nation in the world. With our standard of living and our respect for individual life, we should lead in this respect, as in so many others. Although we have made great strides in medical knowledge, the number of doctors capable of bringing the new knowledge to the people is clearly insufficient. Further, while our medical personnel shortages mount, thousands of splendid young people all over the country lose opportunities which they seek for careers in health work. Most Senators, as I do, must receive tragic and pitiful letters from these young men and women with good college records who cannot get into medical school or dental school or nursing school.

At the turn of the century medical schools sent their graduates forth with the tools of their profession fitting into a small bag. Medical education was hardly more expensive than other professional training. The multi-million-dollar scientific apparatus which today is indispensable to every medical school was largely unknown. Tricked out with a few microscopes and a minimum of laboratory equipment, a host of fly-by-night medical diploma mills could and did operate throughout the country side by side with our leading universities.

But in the intervening years the American Medical Association pioneered in raising the standards of medical schools. During the first two decades of the century, the diploma mills were closed. We witnessed with pride the growth of great privately endowed schools such as Harvard, Yale, Cornell, Chicago, Columbia, and Johns Hopkins. Our public-supported universities developed too, expending the huge sums necessary for the expensive and wonderful technical equipment and clinics that are now an integral part of American medical training. Modern medical education came of age—an expensive but a wonderful baby at that.

The great technological advances of medicine served to send the costs of medical education skyrocketing. In the last decade alone, tuition fees have jumped 148 percent. As parents who contemplate a medical career for a son or daughter know, tuition fees average almost \$550 a year. Many medical schools are forced to charge considerably more. This high cost of tuition is a barrier which today prevents many highly qualified students from dedicating themselves to the practice of the healing arts.

If costs worry parents and students, they also terrify medical school deans and university officers. As a former vice president of a great university, I know that the tuition fees are far too low to meet operating expenses. To cover the costs of each student, the University of

Chicago during my part-time service with it had to put up approximately three more dollars for each student dollar, even if the student had the money to pay his tuition fee in full. At the University of Chicago, basic operating expenses per student have increased 40 percent in the last 5 years alone. The situation is similar in other privately operated medical schools.

Under these circumstances it is obvious that our medical schools are operating at so great a loss that they cannot possibly contemplate expansion unless further funds are forthcoming. Every additional student increases the deficit, and the deficit can no longer be absorbed. The problem of how to make ends meet harasses the great majority if not all of the Nation's 79 medical schools.

The deans of these schools know from first-hand experience that they are operating further in the red every year. Almost half of them have been forced to cut back on one or more vital programs. To their dismay, the quality of medical education is threatened. Their equipment and physical plants are rapidly deteriorating.

The administrators and trustees of our universities, as well as the medical deans, agree on the need for more funds. The medical schools unfortunately are a severe drain on the finances of the other departments and divisions of our universities. They help boost the tuition fees that must be charged to students in the other divisions.

Many expert bodies likewise agree on the urgency of our medical schools' need for funds. The National Fund for Medical Education, mentioned earlier, declares:

The situation is so grave that some schools may be forced to close their doors.

The same findings are reported by the Surgeon General's Committee on Medical School Grants and Finances.

Mr. President, I submit that the pending bill is the sound bipartisan answer to the national need in this area. The bill passed the Senate last year without a single objection, but unfortunately the House took no action. At the time the Eighty-second Congress convened, the Korean crisis had become acute and President Truman urged passage of this measure to help meet the national emergency. He listed it in terms of priority comparable to funds required for aircraft, military equipment, and atomic-weapon development. He stated:

Our chronic shortage of doctors, dentists, and nurses will be aggravated as more of them are called into the Armed Forces. Therefore, we need, more than ever, prompt enactment of legislation that will help to increase enrollment in medical and related schools by assisting them to meet their costs of instruction and to construct additional facilities where needed. Scholarships should be provided to attract larger enrollments in nursing schools and grants should be made to States for vocational training for practical nurses.

In response to that appeal the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare took immediate action. Behind their proposed solution lay years of thought about the problems of financing medical

education, as well as prolonged consultations with the Nation's leading medical-school authorities, educators, and university administrators.

From the careful consideration of the committee, several well-conceived principles emerged:

First, that the national interest required action by the Federal Government to meet this problem.

Second, that every possible source of funds—private sources and endowments, local and State moneys—must first be employed, with Federal funds used only as a last resort.

Third, that if Federal funds are found to be necessary, they should be provided on a limited, emergency basis only, and should be so administered as to safeguard the schools against any kind of Federal interference or control. The principle of Federal aid is approved, I point out, by the Hoover Commission task force on Federal medical services.

With the aid of the Nation's leading medical school deans and of other professional authorities, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare drafted the present bill, S. 337. It provides for Federal assistance to approved professional schools to maintain enrollments, to expand facilities, and to promote professional training.

Mr. President, I congratulate the committee on this bill; and I congratulate, in particular, the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] on the leadership he has taken in developing this bill.

The Federal assistance is to be administered by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service with the help of a 10-member advisory council.

I have studied carefully the provisions of this bill, particularly the safeguards in section 383, reading them as a former university vice president and a present university trustee might be expected to read them, that is, with a critical eye. I was prepared to offer objections if I detected any avenues open to Federal interference with the operation of our private and State educational institutions. However, the bill provides in the strongest language against any interference by the Federal Government into the curriculum or administration or the academic freedom of medical schools, educators, and students.

Evidently educators and medical school officers throughout the country have reached the same conclusion I have. The overwhelming majority have gone on record in favor of this measure. This list is too long for me to recite, but I am pleased to note that it includes the School of Public Health and the School of Medicine of Yale University, great national schools located in my State of Connecticut, and also the School of Medicine of the University of Chicago. Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, with whom I served while he was chancellor of the University of Chicago, headed a national committee of university officials in support of this legislation.

Furthermore, this bill has the endorsement of many lay organizations. It is supported also by many professional organizations, including the American

Dental Association, American Association of Dental Schools, American Council on Education, the American Public Health Association, Association of American Medical Colleges, the Association of American Universities, Association of Land Grant Colleges, Association of Schools of Public Health, National Dental Association, and the National Health Council.

The bill comes to us with unanimous committee endorsement, and under sponsorship of leading members of both political parties. It is approved by such an outstanding leader of our voluntary health insurance plans as Dr. Charles Garside, president of the Associated Hospital Service of New York, who told the Greater New York Hospital Association last May:

Quite apart from Blue Cross and its relation to the problem, I very definitely favor Federal grants-in-aid to medical colleges. I see no more danger to our liberties in this proposal than I do in the Federal Hospital Construction Act.

The views of Dr. Morris Fishbein, with whom I have been acquainted for more than 20 years, and who long has been the most vocal spokesman of medical organizations in the United States, also appear to coincide with the intent of the bill. His views were reported as follows in the New York Times of June 7, 1951:

An overwhelming rush of American students to European medical schools was reported yesterday by Dr. Morris Fishbein, former president of the American Medical Association, on his return from a European survey aboard the Cunard liner *Queen Elizabeth*.

Dr. Fishbein said that the situation represents a need that must be met by extension of medical education facilities in this country, where schools are limited in their admissions by availability of teachers and laboratory facilities.

"I feel that the need for more medical men is so acute," he declared, "that we shall have to find some means of utilizing Government funds without sustaining Government control to advance medical education."

These and other expressions from professional sources, supporting the principle or the text of the measure, should satisfy the most fearful that nothing in this bill gives the slightest encouragement to socialized medicine.

My plea for the passage of Senate bill 337 is also based on the views of Mr. Hoover's voluntary fund-raising group, the national funds for medical education:

In the pattern that is envisioned for the support of medical and scientific education, business, and industry and other groups in the community, on one hand, would be working in cooperation with Government, on the other. They would be working as partners toward a common objective, each in its own sphere, and fighting it out not with each other but side by side against the greatest enemy of men—disease—including the yet unconquered problem of cancer, mental illness, heart disease, arthritis, poliomyelitis, tuberculosis, and others.

The medical research problem and the educational problem are, in a sense, two different matters. But, in a broader sense, research and education best flourish and complement each other, in an environment allowing wide latitude for original scientific thinking. To the extent that the scientific educational environment remains unfet-

tered, the scientific research environment will profit.

The cooperation, at an educational level, between Government and industry will help to insure an atmosphere of research and pedagogy in which man may be able to achieve many things, including one objective close to his heart—the maintaining of useful, productive capacities through the sixth, seventh, and eighth decades of life. There is no mistaking that in an aging society such as America's, the battle lines are being drawn today to conquer the debilitating diseases of the middle and late years.

But this great effort, no matter how well intentioned, will fail utterly unless America makes a greater investment in brains and ability, in human resources, and makes it in such a way that every safeguard is taken to preserve the individual's freedom.

Mr. President, to accomplish our essential goal of maintaining our Nation's health through an adequate supply of physicians, dentists, and nurses, I therefore urge the Senate today to do its part by voting for Senate bill 337. Only by so doing can we complement the voluntary efforts of the National Fund for Medical Education and the American Medical Association. Federal as well as voluntary funds are needed; neither alone can do the job. I point out that after several years of careful, diligent work, the National Fund for Medical Education, together with the AMA, have been able to raise only enough money approximately to enable each medical school to finance the education of one more doctor for the full medical course.

By the most optimistic estimates, these two great private sources cannot raise more than a few million dollars a year. I ask my colleagues in the Senate to measure this against the needs submitted by the medical schools themselves merely to continue graduating 6,000 doctors yearly. I am told that \$40,000,000 more is needed yearly to enable the schools to stay out of the red while they maintain high quality of instruction; another \$330,000,000 capital investment is needed for new buildings, laboratories, and equipment. To increase enrollment the needed 22 percent—a working goal set by medical-school deans—would cost, in addition to the above amounts, \$18,000,000 yearly for increased operations, plus \$244,000,000 for construction and equipment. Mr. President, these are merely estimates in regard to our present medical schools. But over and above these schools new medical schools should be built. Our University of Connecticut, near Hartford, has no medical school. The entire area of greater Hartford has no medical school. Most certainly new medical schools need to be established. For my own State, I submit the need for a first-rate medical school in conjunction with the University of Connecticut, in the greater Hartford area.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield. Let me say that I have almost completed my statement.

Mr. PASTORE. At this juncture of the statement which is being made by

the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, I wonder whether he is interested in certain figures which I have before me. Although nothing in this bill will cure the grave situation reflected by these figures, the fact still remains that the bill is a step in the right direction toward working out a solution of the problem confronting the American people.

Did the Senator from Connecticut know that in the fall of 1950, Cornell Medical School took only 80 freshmen out of 2,870 applicants; Columbia University took 120 out of 2,800 applicants; Temple took 125 out of 3,089 applicants; Yale took 65 out of 1,401; Tulane took 128 out of 2,000; Northwestern admitted 128 out of 2,103; and Boston University admitted 72 out of 1,875 applicants.

When we realize that all those applicants have received their premedical education and all of them have hoped and dreamed that one day they might go to medical school and become doctors—

Mr. BENTON. And many of them are the sons of doctors.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; that is correct—we can imagine the frustration of those young men and young women.

There is nothing we can do now to solve this problem completely; but the fact still remains that we need more doctors for our civilian requirements and for our military requirements. Many young persons wish to become doctors, but the medical schools do not have the faculties or the facilities to produce them.

Mr. BENTON. The Senator from Rhode Island is profoundly correct. The figures he has presented should prove most revealing to the public, and I am glad to have them appear in the RECORD at this point. Of course, the figures are well known to medical-school administrators.

Ten years ago, when I was serving as a part-time officer of the University of Chicago, frequently there would be 600 or 800 applications, or more, for only 65 openings in our great medical school; and hundreds of the young men and women who were rejected were brilliantly prepared and brilliantly qualified to take up the career of medicine. It was a terrible responsibility to select the 65 out of such a large group as the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, who has taken such outstanding leadership in this field, of course, realizes.

The medical schools all over the world, outside the United States, are besieged by applicants from the United States, students who are often not only the sons but even the grandsons of doctors, who will go anywhere in order to obtain their medical training. Their applications having been turned down by the schools here, they are forced to go to Beirut or to Italy or any other country in the world where they can secure admittance and where, in turn, they crowd out the students of each particular country in which the need for doctors in all probability is also acute.

Mr. President, the dollar figures I was reading a moment ago are preinflation figures, based on 1947-48 budgets. Costs

have risen more than 40 percent since then. Further, let me again emphasize that these needed funds apply only to medical schools; they do not cover the needs of our schools of dentistry, nursing, or public health.

Mr. President, recognizing that one of the legitimate arguments against this bill can be the question whether we can afford it. Out of my own background, I venture to assert that the answer to this argument is that we simply cannot afford not to pass this bill.

I see the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] in the chair at this moment. He is the only Member of the Senate who has a degree in the field of dentistry, and I am sure many of his professional friends have often called his attention to the great shortage in the profession which he chose as a young man, and to which he devoted himself for about 15 years.

S. 337, which we are now debating, will help close the critical gaps, but even at best it would provide about \$62,000,000 a year, and this sum only after several years of educational tooling up. Even after the enactment of the bill, there will still be urgent need for additional funds from all other sources, notably from private philanthropies and endowments. It is my hope that such private gifts will be stimulated by the Federal aid proposed here today. This beneficial stimulation has been widely noted by the officers of private institutions which have been receiving Federal or State funds for research purposes.

We cannot afford to allow our system of health education—the foremost in the world—to continue to fall into disrepair. We cannot afford losses due to human suffering, in industrial production, and in national security. We cannot afford to sacrifice the future health of our children. We cannot afford the loss of opportunity for tens of thousands of our capable boys and girls who, without the enactment of this bill, will be unable to train for careers in medical and health work.

I have often been asked whether I favor socialized medicine. The answer is an unqualified "No." I have spent a large part of my life fighting socialism and collectivism in all forms. In my article, the Economics of a Free Society, which was published in Fortune magazine in 1944, and which was written by me as the key policy statement for the Committee for Economic Development, of which I was then the vice chairman, I made my position on socialism in all its forms abundantly clear. I said:

An economic system based on private enterprise, Americans believe, can better serve the common good, not because it enables some men to enrich themselves, but because it develops a high and rapidly rising level of living. It can best insure the American prosperity to vital world prosperity and to world peace. It can provide the maximum economic opportunity for the largest number of individuals of the community. It can foster the development of the native capacity, ambition, and resourcefulness of the individuals of the community, and protect the personal freedom and well-being of the individual from the dangers inherent in too great a concentration of either private or public power.

Mr. President, I have before me a one-page article from Collier's magazine, headed "Our alarming doctor shortage," which has a most interesting box headed "It's not socialized medicine." I ask unanimous consent that this short article in Collier's be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a question?

Mr. BENTON. I shall yield only for this one more question, because I am running over the time I predicted to the junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator agrees with the position I take, that although we are against socialized medicine and have supported the position of the American Medical Association insofar as our opposition to socialized medicine is concerned, many of us believe that the American Medical Association is making a great mistake in taking a position against anything which would, in the long run, mean better health for the people, particularly against having more doctors in order to relieve the shortage of doctors.

Mr. BENTON. I cannot speak authoritatively on this point, but I have frequently observed the great difference between the official views of the officers of many trade and professional associations, on the one hand, and the views and opinions of the membership of the group, on the other. This article in Collier's suggests that a tiny group of well-intentioned men have held back the passage of the bill now pending. The extent to which that is true, as it may relate to the failure of the House to act last year, I cannot attest. I am glad the question of the Senator from Louisiana reminds me to make this statement for the RECORD. For 20 years, notably during my work in education, I have collaborated closely with many members of the medical profession, many of whom I number among my closest friends, and I am sure the majority of the profession cannot fail to agree on the need for greater efforts to bring the best that medical science can provide to all the American people. I hope that answers the question.

Mr. LONG. It does, and I thank the Senator.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I therefore submit to the Senate that it is wholly legitimate for the Government, which represents all the people, to seek to achieve by the enactment of the pending bill the goal I have outlined. All such efforts, however, should be carried forward in close cooperation with the medical profession, which has itself pioneered, and which has done such a magnificent job in the fight to improve the quality and distribution of medical care.

We the people of the United States now stand within reaching distance of major new advances against all the diseases which have decimated man. We can never wholly win the final fight against suffering and disability. But we can go forward—and continue to fight

to go forward—to win for ourselves and our loved ones renewed health and vigor and surcease from pain. Enactment of the bill now before the Senate is essential if we are to maintain and accelerate our progress toward these goals.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, has the Senator from Connecticut yielded the floor?

Mr. BENTON. I now yield the floor. I may add I am most grateful to the Senator from Illinois for his cooperation in permitting me to speak at this time, so that I may resume committee hearings at 2 o'clock, where I am acting as chairman in the hearings of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXHIBIT 1

DR. RUSK ASKS RISE IN PHYSICIAN TOTAL—HE WARNS OF SHORTAGES AHEAD AND URGES LARGER CLASSES, WITH SPEEDED COURSES

(By George Eckel)

CHICAGO, February 12.—Unless medical education is expanded and accelerated at once the Nation faces a deficit of 22,000 physicians by 1954, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, chairman of the national advisory committees on mobilization, said here today. The deficit would be undiminished by 1960 in the absence of measures to counteract it, he added.

Even if both recommended measures were begun at once the deficit in 1954 would be 14,500 physicians, but by 1960 it would be reduced to 2,000, he asserted.

Any such deficits, he declared, meant "a serious threat to the health and welfare of our people."

He called on the medical profession and the medical schools to undertake the added work load necessary to cope with the situation.

Dr. Rusk, who is associate editor of the New York Times, addressed the Forty-seventh Annual Congress on Medical Education and Licensure, sponsored by the American Medical Association, the Advisory Board for Medical Specialists and the Federation of State Medical Boards of the United States.

TWO STUDIES SUMMARIZED

His presentation summarized the conclusions reached by two committees which he heads, the Health Resources Advisory Committee to the National Security Resources Board and the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Doctors, Dentists and Allied Specialists to the Selective Service System.

Dr. Rusk held, that unless the profession was to fail to meet the mobilization challenge, enrollments in medical schools must be increased by 15 percent and accelerated courses of studies must be instituted to turn out an extra class every 3 years.

Some 178,000 physicians were in active practice today, he stated, and by 1954 there would be a need for 210,600. The expected supply under present conditions would be about 188,600, he added.

The estimate, proceeded, was predicated on Armed Forces of 5,000,000 men by 1954 and continuing at that level through 1960. If the ceiling through 1960 was not raised above the 3,500,000 men in uniform contemplated by the end of this year the deficit could be reduced by 2,000 to 20,000, he said.

Dr. Rusk declared that the studies by the two committees made these assumptions:

1. The emergency state of part or complete mobilization would continue for 10 years.
2. The 1949 ratio of physicians to population in the civilian population was accepted as adequate and was used as a base line.
3. The ratio of physicians to service men and women in the Armed Forces would have settled by 1954 to 2.7 per 1,000, a rate sub-

stantially below the World War II rate and below the present rate.

4. The estimate of physicians required for civilian defense must assume the possibility of catastrophe, not only physical but epidemic.

A 15-percent increase in enrollments of medical schools, which now graduate 6,000 physicians a year, would not produce any increase in graduates until June of 1955, or of graduates who have finished a 1-year internship until June 1956, at the earliest, Dr. Rusk stated.

GAIN BY MEASURE ESTIMATED

By 1960 this measure alone, he added, would reduce the prospective deficit of 22,000 by only 5,000. The increase per class in World War II was 12½ percent, he noted.

Acceleration of medical training by running four 9-month school years together and completing them within 36 months, would yield 6,000 additional physicians every 3 years, he said.

By 1954 this would reduce the deficit in active physicians from 22,000 to 14,500 and by 1960 to 10,000, he estimated.

After stating that, based on the Armed Forces reaching and keeping a level of 5,000,000, the two measures together would cut the deficit in 1954 to 14,500 and in 1960 to 2,000. He said that if the Armed Forces did not exceed 3,500,000 the two measures together would erase the deficit by 1960.

Physician requirements by category in 1954, if the Armed Forces had 5,000,000 men, were analyzed as follows by Dr. Rusk: 183,600 for the civilian population, 3,300 for civilian defense, 1,800 for industry and rehabilitation, 2,800 for public health, 500 for medical schools and 18,500 for the Armed Forces.

Dr. Rusk defended the measures he recommended, despite the known defects of acceleration, as the only solutions to a situation in which nothing is possible to avoid or even reduce this deficit before 1954.

"These plans are flexible, and no permanent oversupply is imposed," he declared. "Any part of the program could be adjusted if the situation eased enough to permit it."

"No account is taken of the increased aging of our population, or of the rehabilitation of the wounded veterans coming back from combat."

He noted that, "we recognize the difficulties of an accelerated program."

"We should, however," he went on, "be able to profit by our experience in the last war. The depletion of teachers can be prevented, internships could be extended rather than curtailed, inasmuch as interns already are performing medical services."

Dr. Rusk stated that the present authorized physician ratio in the armed services was 5 per 1,000 men, calling for 17,500 this year in that category alone, but plans called for a tapering off to 3.7 per 1,000 men, as the requirements are less after the formative "shakedown" phase of mobilization.

A panel discussion on problems arising from mobilization following Dr. Rusk's presentation showed varying opinions on his recommendations.

Dr. Stockton Kimball, dean of the University of Buffalo Medical School and chairman of the Joint Committee on Medical Education in Time of National Emergency, reported that three-fourths of the medical schools in the Association of American Medical Colleges did not favor the principle of acceleration.

"Practically, each of the errors in medical education during the last war we are now asked to repeat," he stated.

Dr. Kimball also produced estimates that for an expansion of 1,000 in enrollments by 1954, approximately the 15 percent recommended by Dr. Rusk, medical schools would require an additional \$6,200,000 for operating expenses, an additional \$67,000,000 for new school construction and an additional \$32,000,000 for hospital construction.

On the question of financial aid to schools, Dr. Rusk said that the Health Resources Advisory Committee would, if necessary, back any reasonable program to provide adequate funds with adequate safeguards.

Dr. Victor Johnson, director of the Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research, Rochester, Minn., raised a question on Dr. Rusk's figures for civilian requirement of physicians.

If the 22,000-physician deficit developed, he said, it would be almost entirely at the expense of the civilian population. On the basis of Dr. Rusk's figures, he added, this would reduce the civilian physician ratio only from 1 in 850, the 1949 level, to 1 in 950, whereas during World War II the ratio was 1 to 1,350, admittedly too small. Would so slight a reduction make so much difference? he asked in effect.

Dr. Rusk replied that we needed the physician ratio we had in 1949, that in World War II we were lucky in having "nothing that even looked like a major epidemic," and that the obstetrical case load was very low because of the absence of 18,000,000 men.

He remarked that many physicians were heavily overworked in the last war.

Col. Richard H. Eanes, chief medical officer of the Selective Service System, declared that a draft of physicians might not be necessary because military requirements might be met through the efforts of the profession.

EXHIBIT 2

OUR ALARMING DOCTOR SHORTAGE—WE DESPERATELY NEED PHYSICIANS; YET THE LEADERS OF ORGANIZED MEDICINE WON'T LET CONGRESS ACT

(By Albert Q. Maisel)

A tiny group of well-intentioned men has placed your health, and even your chances of atomic-age survival, in the most serious jeopardy. These men mean you no harm. Indeed, they are the leaders of the American Medical Association, an organization sincerely dedicated to fighting disease and saving life.

Yet they must shoulder major responsibility for a shortage of medical personnel which is constantly becoming more critical. They are the one big obstacle in the path of congressional efforts to meet that shortage with Federal aid to medical education—a solution which has the backing of most medical school deans, of leading university presidents, of both Republicans and Democrats, and (by a unanimous vote) of the United States Senate.

The bill which embodies this solution was drawn up with the advice of AMA representatives; time after time it was modified to meet their objections, and in its present form it represents almost precisely what they wanted in the first place. Nevertheless, the American Medical Association's leaders have fought the measure to a dead stop in the House of Representatives.

By so doing, they have made it entirely possible that wounded American soldiers, in the future, will receive some second- or third-rate substitute for the marvelous medical services that saved tens of thousands of lives in World War II. Because of what they have done and what they have prevented from being done, civilian atomic-bomb victims may perish untended. Mothers, lacking a physician's help, may die in childbirth under the ministrations of incompetent midwives. Plagues and epidemics, which we all thought banished forever, may return to claim millions of victims.

These are not the dire and gloomy forebodings of neurotic alarmists or scare-peddling sensationalists. They are rather the considered private predictions of shocked and worried experts who, ever since the end of World War II, have been trying to get

the organized medical profession to take steps to overcome a growing shortage of physicians, nurses, dentists and public health technicians.

Behind this shortage lies the fact that our medical and other health education schools cannot expand for lack of funds. Many of them are so deep in the red that they may even have to fold up entirely.

AMA SECRETARY MAKES A FORECAST

The shortage of physicians has been recognized for years. In May 1945, for example, Dr. Victor Johnson (then secretary of the American Medical Association's council on medical education and hospitals) testified before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs that, while we would need 35,000 more physicians after World War II, our training program was geared to provide us with an increase of less than half this number by 1948.

Despite this warning of a growing shortage of doctors, even for civilian needs, we demobilized our medical schools, along with everything else, when World War II ended. Financial difficulties—and a desire to improve the quality of training—led college after college to cut back its student roster, often by as much as 20 to 30 percent. Instead of training more doctors than ever before, we began to train fewer. Our nursing, dental, and public health schools all moved in the same direction.

In October 1947, Dr. Donald G. Anderson, the new secretary of the AMA Council, stated, "We are prepared to contend that the maximum deficit that could possibly be forecast for 1960 does not exceed 15,000 physicians."

Anderson's words were couched in terms designed to minimize the problem. Yet they amounted to a startling admission. For according to the 1950 American Medical Directory, there are about 200,000 physicians for more than 150,000,000 Americans—an average of one doctor for every 750 persons. Since this includes doctors doing research and other work not directly connected with the care of patients, the actual number of persons per general practitioner is estimated to run as high as 1,500. Taking 1,000 as a conservative figure, what Anderson was actually saying was that approximately 1 in every 10 of us would be without doctors in 1960, or that all of us would be averaging 10 percent less medical service than we needed and were willing to pay for.

A similar situation of chronic shortage has been developing in the other health-service professions.

We have only 280,500 professional nurses. Right now, without allowing for the expanding needs of the armed services, 74,000 more are required. But enrollments in our schools of nursing have dropped to less than two-thirds of the wartime peak.

We have 75,000 practicing dentists. By 1960, the United States Public Health Service reports, we will need at least 95,000. But our dental schools can't train enough, unless their capacity is substantially increased. A continuing deficit of at least 5,000 dentists looms.

The same is true for nursing teachers, doctors of public health, sanitary engineers, and all the other groups of specialized health technicians. Far from overcoming these deficits, we have been falling ever farther behind in training new medical personnel.

In 1910, our medical schools graduated 4,440 students, producing one new doctor for every 20,000 of our population. By 1940 the number of graduates had increased to 5,097, but the growth of population had far outstripped the increase in doctors. In that year we produced only one doctor for every 26,000 of our people. In 1950 our physician output mounted to 5,553. But, once again, it did not keep pace with population growth. We produced this year only one new doctor for every 27,000 people.

Worst of all, our schools of medicine, dentistry, nursing, and public health find themselves in a deep and growing financial crisis. Their costs have been mounting, but their income has not nearly kept pace.

This country's 79 medical schools, for example, had a total budget last year of more than \$61,000,000. They had to spend an average of \$2,577 for every student. But their tuition fees averaged only \$548. Income from research grants, endowments, State appropriations and all other sources still left a gap of more than \$10,000,000.

More than three-quarters of the 44 privately owned medical schools have been operating at a deficit. Even a number of the tax-supported State schools have been running into the red. According to the American Medical Association, only eight schools reported, a year ago, that they did not stand in urgent need of additional operating funds to meet essential costs.

The same situation has been hog-tying our other health education schools. Dental colleges, with an average tuition fee of \$500 a year per student, have had to find \$2,000 per year to cover the cost of educating each person. The schools of public health, with tuition fees averaging only \$440, have actually been spending an average of seven times as much per student.

Even the American Medical Association's council on medical education and hospitals, when it surveyed the sorry situation of the medical schools more than 2 years ago, found that they needed an additional \$15,000,000 a year to support their operations and nearly \$200,000,000 of capital funds to construct urgently needed facilities.

In the words of Herbert Hoover, "Our medical educational system is woefully inadequate for the conduct of our national defense and our Federal hospitals for veterans and others. And it is doubly inadequate for the needs of the people generally."

In the event of all-out war, no other non-industrial bottleneck will do more to endanger our chances for victory than these shortages of medical personnel. For we shall need more doctors and nurses than ever before in our history.

Our armed services will be compelled to drain the home front of tens of thousands of doctors. But home-front needs will be infinitely greater than they were in the past.

WHEN WAR RAVAGES THE HOME FRONT

Listen, for example, to the carefully weighed words of Dr. P. J. Carroll, dean of the School of Medicine of Creighton University in Omaha. "In the event of another world war," Dr. Carroll warns "we shall not be able to leave the civilian population without adequate medical services as was done during the last war. There was no conflict or even a threat of conflict within our borders. The next war will be different. Our large cities will be enemy targets and a large part of our population will be evacuated. It will be necessary to disperse our civilian population in small concentrations, away from military installations. The greater the dispersion of our people, the greater will be the need for more physicians."

It is this dilemma—the need for more doctors and nurses for the services, coupled with a multiplied need for the same doctors and nurses at home—that is giving sleepless nights to the experts of the National Security Resources Board and the other agencies whose duty it is to prepare for both mobilization and civil defense.

They have no hope of really solving the problem in the sense of having enough doctors and nurses both to meet all military needs and fully to protect civilian health. Our chance to achieve that goal has been frittered away in 5 years of inaction since the end of World War II.

The best they can hope for, today, is to arrive somehow at a formula that will equalize the shortage, a scheme that will go as

far as possible toward taking care of military needs without leaving us utterly stripped of medical resources to meet ordinary civilian needs—plus the tremendous medical demands of atomic or bacteriological defense.

The experts have one other hope. Given a few years of even partial peace, the training of large numbers of doctors, dentists, nurses, and technicians might be started if the program got a great shot in the arm.

Faced with this alarming situation, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, bitterly split between proponents of national health insurance and those who fight it as socialized medicine, decided in the spring of 1949 to separate the problem of medical education from its long-stymied omnibus National Health Act. This, the Senators felt, might lead to something they all could agree on to aid the medical and other health education schools.

A bill was drawn up to provide Federal subsidies—\$500 per student in the case of medical schools—to help meet current operating deficits. Additional sums were to be available for any school that increased its roster, and to aid the schools in expanding their physical facilities grants of \$5,000,000 a year were to be allotted for construction and equipment.

This bill was sponsored not only by such Fair Dealers as Senators James E. Murray, of Montana, and Claude Pepper, of Florida, but also by two outstanding Republicans, Senators Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, and Forrest Donnell, of Missouri. The Hoover Commission backed its principles. President Truman got behind it. The Association of American Medical Colleges anxiously urged its passage. Most of the State-owned medical schools supported it. The privately owned medical schools were almost unanimous in their endorsement.

Nevertheless, anxious to meet all possible objections, the Senate committee followed up its public hearings with a week-long series of conferences with representatives of the American Medical Association and the other health professions.

At these meetings, under the chairmanship of Lowell J. Reed, vice president of Johns Hopkins University, every conceivable objection to the original draft of the bill was freely raised and discussed.

A CONCESSION TO MEDICAL OPINION

The original measure, for example, provided for an advisory council representing the health professions, to be appointed by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator. The representatives of the American Medical Association, however, objected to giving this much influence to Oscar Ewing, the Administrator, whom they deeply mistrusted as a leading advocate of compulsory health insurance. Instead, they asked that the measure provide for Presidential appointment of the advisory council. This change was made.

The early draft of the bill provided a ceiling of 50 percent on the proportion of the budget of any school that might be met by Federal subsidies. This ceiling was designed to preserve local interest in supporting medical education and to prevent the Federal subsidy from dominating the picture. Under the formulas for subsidy, the richer and larger schools would never approach the ceiling. But the representatives of the medical schools and of the universities felt that the 50 percent figure was essential if adequate help were to be given to the most needy schools.

The American Medical Association representatives, extremely fearful of so great a Federal participation in the support of medical education, held out for a ceiling of 30 percent. Ultimately the Senate Committee compromised at 40 percent.

Still wary of Federal influence, the representatives of the AMA asked that the ad-

visory council be granted a veto power over the actions of the Surgeon General in administering and allotting the subsidies. The medical school deans and the other educators, who long have handled research grants administered by the Surgeon General, felt no such apprehensions. But, to keep the peace, they agreed that the bill should be changed to require the Surgeon General to promulgate regulations only "after obtaining the advice and recommendations of the council."

Going even further to allay the AMA representatives' fear of Federal domination, the conferees recommended empowering the advisory council to make reports directly to Congress. This provision was designed to prevent any possibility that a politically motivated administrator might muzzle the council. Any conflicts between the representatives of the medical professions and the administrator would be brought right out into the open. Once again, the safeguards sought by the AMA were written into the Senate bill.

With the sole exception of the 40 percent compromise, every change requested by the representatives of the American Medical Association at these closed-door conferences was incorporated in the committee's final version of the bill—and the bill was sponsored by every Senator on the committee, with a single exception.

To protect the schools against bureaucratic interference with their teaching programs or their methods of operation, the bill contained rigid prohibitions against Federal "direction, supervision, or control . . . with respect to personnel, curriculum, or instruction."

When the measure was reported on the floor of the Senate in August, 1949, a routine objection was raised to its immediate passage by unanimous consent. At this juncture, both Senators Pepper and Taft, long bitter opponents on most other questions concerning the public health, stood up and urged their colleagues to support the measure. Two weeks later, when the bill again appeared on the calendar, it passed unanimously.

FEARED TACTICS OF LOBBYISTS

The worried deans and directors of the medical, dental, and nursing schools breathed a sigh of relief. For, they figured, if the American Medical Association were opposed to the bill its powerful Washington lobby would have shown its hand in the Senate, would have blocked this measure (as it had blocked many others) in committee or, at a very minimum, would have forced a debate and a counting of noses on the Senate floor.

For the AMA lobby is powerful indeed. It operates through two channels. Officially the AMA is represented by Dr. Joseph S. Lawrence, director of its Washington office. But the real power behind the scenes is the California publicity firm of Whitaker & Baxter which, for the last 2 years, has been directing the American Medical Association's well-heeled national educational campaign—aimed at preventing passage of the administration's compulsory health insurance program. Lawrence, Whitaker, and Baxter are registered with Congress as lobbyists.

Many of the medical school deans, unversed in the intricacies of politics, felt so certain that the aid to medical education bill would easily pass the House that they authorized the enrollment of larger classes than their schools had handled at any time since the war. The number of freshmen admitted to medical school jumped, in 1950, by 5.3 percent over the preceding year.

AMENDED TO MEET OBJECTIONS

In the House the Biemiller bill, a duplicate of the Senate measure, again received bipartisan support. Representative HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, former Republican National Committee chairman and long-time opponent of socialized medicine, joined

with Democratic Congressman Andrew J. Biemiller, of Wisconsin, in sponsoring amendments to the original House bill to make it meet the AMA objections brought forth in the Lowell Reed conferences. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce promptly reported favorably on the altered bill.

By then, late in the session, it was necessary for the House Rules Committee to speed action on the measure if the whole House was to vote on it without delay. This procedure promised to be routine.

But suddenly the appiecart was upset.

A small group of insurgent members of nurses' organizations in Georgia and North Carolina, and the owner of a private hospital in the latter State, got the impression that the measure would somehow set up the American Nursing Association as an accrediting body for all nursing schools—and thus force the closing down, for lack of accreditation, of some of the less qualified schools in the Southern States.

On behalf of this group, Representative ROBERT L. (MULEY) DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, protested to the Rules Committee. The sponsors of the bill offered to amend the measure to overcome this objection. That satisfied DOUGHTON, and he withdrew his protest.

But the Biemiller bill had, by then, been labeled "controversial." The Rules Committee, fearful of setting a precedent that would throw a host of other controversial measures onto the House floor in the last 2 weeks of the session, withheld its approval. The bill was held up till Congress could meet again, in 1950.

Even after Congress adjourned, the American Medical Association's opposition had not crystallized. Early in December 1949, the House of Delegates of the AMA met in Washington and approved a report of its council on medical education and hospitals which declared that, "While the council is not entirely satisfied with the bill, it does incorporate several modifications suggested by the council's representatives and it is a distinct improvement over any other bill for Federal aid to medical education that has been introduced."

The report added, "The council is aware that Federal aid to medical education creates definite hazards to the continued freedom and independence of the medical schools. With few exceptions, however, the medical schools and their parent universities have expressed the opinion that, unless additional aid is provided, medical education in this country cannot achieve its full development. The legislation which has been passed by the Senate contains safeguards that should protect the medical schools from unwarranted interference in their affairs by the Federal Government."

SUDDEN CHANGE OF SENTIMENT

Less than 2 months later the AMA completely changed its tune. At a conference of its national education campaign, Louis H. Bauer, M. D., chairman of the board of trustees, stated the AMA's position on pending legislation. The aid to medical education measure was added to the long list of bills which the AMA opposed.

Said Bauer, "As the bill is presently drawn, we feel it would give the Government a foot in the door—in fact, probably 2 feet in the door—for Federal control of medical education. There are certain very drastic amendments which will have to be made to that bill before we can approve it."

The strategy behind this shift in position was explained by Clem Whitaker, head of Whitaker & Baxter, who called the aid to education measure a fringe bill which, he said, masked hidden threats.

"Instead of being confronted with the task of defeating a revolutionary program of Government medicine, embodied in a single proposal, or in companion bills," Whitaker con-

tinued, "we are now faced with a series of measures—disarming in language but dangerous in their provisions—some of which must be beaten and some drastically changed or amended."

In the face of this attack, the House sponsors of the aid to medical education bill tried to go even further than did their Senate colleagues in meeting AMA objections. The Senate compromise which set subsidy maximums at 40 percent was dropped and replaced by the figure of 30 percent, which the AMA's representatives had originally asked for.

The clause guaranteeing academic freedom from Federal interference was revised and enlarged, at the suggestion of the AMA's Dr. Donald G. Anderson, so that every detail of protection could be carefully spelled out in the bill itself.

The provisions governing the promulgation of regulations were altered, again in keeping with earlier AMA suggestions. In the latest version of the bill, the professional advisory council would have to approve any regulation of the Surgeon General before it could take effect.

The AMA's friends on the House subcommittee kept it working over revisions until late last May, in what Representative Biemiller characterized as a "stalling-twisting-turning-convincing policy of compromise-and-then-oppose-the-compromise." Finally, with subcommittee approval won at last the Biemiller bill came before full Interstate Commerce Committee on June 19—only to be defeated by a one-vote margin.

On June 25, employing a parliamentary device, Biemiller got the matter again before the Commerce Committee in the form of a new bill incorporating all the amendments that had been tacked onto the old one. Once again he lost out by a single vote. The committee decided not to consider the bill until after August 8, when—as it then appeared—Congress would have adjourned and gone home.

But the outbreak of the Korean war did two things. It changed plans for adjournment, and it served to highlight the urgency of drastic action to get medical education into high gear. When the North Koreans crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, our armed services had 5,844 physicians on their rolls. They needed about 1,550 more.

The Army, whose need was the most desperate, sent out a call to 3,000 Reserve lieutenants and captains in the Medical Corps, requesting their return to service. Only 200 replied, and of these only 15 volunteered.

By mid-August it became apparent that voluntary enlistments of physicians and nurses would never begin to meet the service's needs, even for a limited mobilization. The Defense Department found itself compelled to run to Congress for the hurried passage of a doctors draft bill. First on the list were 7,500 young doctors and dentists who had received their medical education at Government expense while deferred from active military service during World War II. But the draft bill was not limited to these men alone. It authorized the President to order a general registration and induction of physicians up to the age of 55 and of dentists through the age of 45.

To meet the needs of a 3,000,000-man force, the armed services will have to drain from civilian life substantially more than 5,000 physicians and proportionately large numbers of dentists, nurses, and technicians.

Thus the initial stages of the crisis anticipated by the proponents of the aid to medical education bills are already upon us.

Any further expansion of the armed services will require additional levies against our already shorthanded civilian health personnel. All-out war, on a global scale, will require well over 42,000 of our youngest and most active physicians.

Facing up to this crisis, Representative Biemiller led a strenuous campaign in Congress all through last July and August to get the aid to medical education measure reported out to the House. Day after day he read into the record endorsements of the bill's passage: by Dean George W. Bakeman, of the Medical College of Virginia; by Dean Murray Kinsman, of the University of Louisville; by Dr. A. C. Ivy, vice president of the University of Illinois; Dean Willard C. Rappleye, of Columbia University; Chancellor Robert Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, and many others.

HOW MEDICAL SCHOOLS VOTED

Dean Joseph C. Hinsey, of Cornell University, chairman of the executive council of the Association of American Medical Colleges, wrote that a poll of its membership showed 47 schools favoring the bill and only 16 opposed. He disavowed the action of the AMA as "taken independently of our association . . . and without a poll of our membership."

The deans of all the schools of medicine, dentistry, and public health in Massachusetts, including Harvard, Tufts, and Boston University, declared, "We are convinced that the present desperate plight of our professional schools, not only in Massachusetts, but throughout the United States, has already interfered with the quality of professional education and is preventing the development of adequate medical and health personnel for the country."

"We make this statement," they add, "in full awareness of the position recently taken by the American Medical Association. We vigorously oppose that position."

Despite this campaign, the AMA opposition once again carried the day. On August 16, the Biemiller bill, which President Truman had characterized as "the most vital health legislation before Congress," was tabled in the Interstate Commerce Committee by a 9-to-8 vote.

Protesting this action, Dean James S. Simmons, of Harvard University, called it "a tragic mistake" and "a crippling blow to the Nation's military and civil preparedness program."

Scores of similar protests flooded in upon Congress. But, last August 30, the House Interstate Commerce Committee again decided to table the program. Shortly thereafter, Congress recessed.

Despite this tendency on the part of Congress and the AMA to look the other way, the grave problem of medical shortages still exists, and the pressure is mounting for some action to solve it. Among those plugging for such a move is Bernard M. Baruch. "I am not in favor of socialized medicine," the famed adviser to Presidents said recently, "but the medical profession has got to do something to meet the needs of the masses. The first way is to increase the output of doctors."

Thus it appears certain that the next Congress will find itself confronted with the same hot potato—unless some alternative method of enlarging our health training schools can be discovered.

BUT ARE THERE ANY ALTERNATIVES?

Dr. Willard C. Rappleye, of Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons, has offered one suggestion: A change in pre-medical education. If this were eliminated or cut down as a requirement for entering medical schools a few hundred doctors might graduate a year or so sooner—if the schools could find room for them as students. But, since the real bottleneck causing the doctor shortage lies in the medical schools themselves, Dr. Rappleye's proposal does not touch the core of the problem.

SUGGESTS ABOLISHING INTERNS

Dr. William Lee Hart, dean of the University of Texas' Southwestern Medical School, has proposed the abolition of internships and

their replacement by a year of apprenticeship under older doctors. This proposal is certain to meet the stiffest opposition from both the American Medical Association and the thousands of hospitals whose entire set-up is dependent upon a continued supply of interns. But even if adopted, it would merely shift young physicians from the hospitals, where they are sorely needed, into doctors' offices.

The most likely alternative to Federal subsidies for medical education is the idea of a voluntary fund to raise money, free from Federal control. The American Medical Association has long toyed with this idea. Last January a national fund for medical education was actually incorporated under the honorary chairmanship of Herbert Hoover. Its board of trustees—from Winthrop Aldrich to George Whitney—is diamond-studded with leaders of industry, finance, and banking. Its objective is worthy. Its personnel is top-notch. If ever a fund-raising plan were capable of achieving its full potential, this would appear to be the one.

Yet, what is that potential? In its prospectus, addressed to leading industrialists, the fund detailed the medical schools' need to overcome a \$10,000,000 deficit. But it proposed to raise, through voluntary subscriptions, only \$1,000,000. The balance, the prospectus conceded, would have to come from the Federal Treasury.

TO PRESERVE ACADEMIC FREEDOM

The best the fund could hope for was that private sources for support might be stimulated so that "there will be created a balance under which the academic freedom essential to scientific medical education will be preserved."

Thus, the voluntary fund-raising organization turns out to be, at best, only a partial supplement to Federal aid; a 10-percent counterweight rather than a full-fledged substitute.

There may be still other ways of achieving the necessary expansion of medical and health education. But if there are 5 years of searching by the medical schools themselves and by the American Medical Association have not turned them up.

Thus, Congress, when it meets again, will have the old doctor-shortage headache on its hands once more. To the pressure from the President, from public health officials, from the universities and from almost all of our schools of health education, there will now be added a further tremendous pressure from the Defense Department, made acutely aware, by the Korean crisis, of the weakness in our medical armament.

Whether the American Medical Association can buck this tidal wave remains to be seen.

But one thing is certain. Unless immediate steps are taken to solve our chronic and growing shortage of medical, dental, nursing and public health personnel, your health—and that of your family, your neighbors and your sons in the services—will be jeopardized for years to come.

IT'S NOT "SOCIALIZED MEDICINE"

The article on this page sets forth a serious national problem that, in another all-out war, could become a national catastrophe. Few will bother to deny the present shortage of medical personnel. Few will deny the actual and potential dangers of such a shortage. Few will question its obvious solution. The country's medical schools must have money in order to expand and to reduce the sometimes prohibitive cost of medical education.

There is strong public and professional support for financing an expansion program with Federal funds. But the leaders of the American Medical Association are against the idea. So far they have blocked the passage of legislation which would make such a program possible.

Collier's thinks that their stand is wrong. We appreciate the association's great contributions in maintaining high professional

standards and protecting public health and safety. Yet, in this case their attitude seems narrow, and their case weak.

Federal aid to medical education is not "socialized medicine." And as long as the danger of general war and atomic attack against our civilian population exists, the argument that Federal aid may lead to Federal control of medical education is academic, to say the least.

We hope that the AMA leaders will withdraw their opposition. The Senate has already passed a bill which would provide money to end the doctor shortage. If the AMA continues its fight in the new Congress, we trust that the law-makers will have the courage to enact the measure anyway in the interest of urgent necessity.

THE EDITOR.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on occasions like this, when I encounter a bill which has dual sponsorship and contains the names of some very distinguished Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, I feel a good deal like that old picture which may have been painted by Doré long ago, showing the martyrs in the arena, with the legend "morituri te salutamus." Senators who are Latin students will correct me, if I am wrong, but I think that was the legend, which means "we (who are) about to die salute thee." Well, Mr. President, it is not the first time I have died on this legislative battlefield by being defeated, but I find that I would be recreant—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I may say the purpose of this bill is to provide more doctors, so that many people may not die in their early years. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am quite aware of the viewpoint expressed on the proponents' side, but I would feel rather remiss in my duty and in my sense of conviction, Mr. President, did I not oppose the bill.

Mr. President, I propose first to look at the general purposes which are involved.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield for that purpose?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think what the Senator from Illinois is about to say ought to be heard by more Senators. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bennett	Eaton	Jenner
Benton	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Brewster	Ferguson	Johnson, Tex.
Bricker	Frear	Johnson, S. C.
Bridges	Fulbright	Kefauver
Butler, Nebr.	George	Kerr
Cain	Gillette	Kilgore
Capehart	Green	Knowland
Carlson	Hayden	Langer
Case	Hendrickson	Lehman
Chavez	Hickenlooper	Lodge
Connally	Hill	Long
Cordon	Hoey	Magnuson
Dirksen	Holland	Malone
Douglas	Humphrey	Maybank
Duff	Hunt	McCarran
Dworshak	Ives	McCarthy

McClellan	O'Connor	Stennis
McFarland	O'Mahoney	Taft
McKellar	Pastore	Thye
McMahon	Robertson	Underwood
Millikin	Russell	Watkins
Monroney	Saltonstall	Welker
Moody	Schoeppel	Wiley
Morse	Smathers	Williams
Mundt	Smith, N. J.	Young
Neely	Smith, N. C.	
Nixon	Sparkman	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as I indicated in my preliminary statement, I am not unmindful of a general interest in the bill, but notwithstanding what its ultimate fate may be, I am opposed to it. I think, therefore, I ought to labor the bill itself, and to point out my objections, and to make clear to those who read the RECORD and to those who may be in the Chamber this afternoon what I think is in the bill and what is objectionable.

Mr. President, the bill has for its general purpose to make available to certain schools a certain amount of Federal funds so that enrollment may be maintained and increased. Those schools include schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, public health, and so forth.

Like so many other bills, the pending bill comes before the Senate containing one of those rather intricate open-end clauses so often found in legislation. I have encountered them a good many times, and how interesting it is to find this language in an authorization bill, "there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary." Thus, Mr. President, the sky is the limit. Who knows what the bill will cost? But I expect to address myself to the question of cost very directly.

First of all, I desire to indicate why such a bill has been introduced. There is a contention that there is a shortage of doctors in the country. Information on that point has been widespread. I have encountered any number of folders, some of which are not quite accurate statements, from various sources, seek-

ing to emphasize and to point out that there is a shortage of doctors particularly, and that our medical schools do not have the financial capacity to turn out doctors equivalent to the need of the Nation.

Mr. President, in referring to the history of this bill it should be remembered that there was an earlier bill in 1949, which passed the Senate in September of that year, Senate bill 1453. I understand it passed without objection. But that does not carry any weight, because so many bills often find their way to the calendar and out of this Chamber without objection. I have asked the monitors of the calendar from time to time to make sure that when this bill was called up on the calendar, if there was no other objection, then that they object for me. But Senate bill 1453 was passed, and, interestingly enough, it was passed the first time 9 months before Korea.

It cannot be said that this bill had its inception in an emergency, because there was certainly no emergency on the doorstep of the country at that time. It is a good deal like the Spence bill, which became the foundation for the Defense Production Act. I went back to pick up the stitches of the whole history of control, and I have found that the Spence bill, introduced by my old friend, Representative SPENCE, of Kentucky, the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, on which I served years ago, was actually introduced 16 months before Korea. The country at that time was reasonably serene. The country was then at peace. But there is something more than a casual hint in the bill that somebody had in mind a control system for our country. And so here is a bill the lineal parent of which, in the form of Senate bill 1453, went through the Senate 9 months before Korea.

I wish to address myself first of all, Mr. President, to the question of the shortage of doctors, and in doing so I call the attention of the Senate and the country to a rather interesting little folder. The title is "Doctors Wanted." It was published by the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Cooperative Health Federation of America, the Cooperative League of the United States, the Committee for the Nation's Health, and the National Grange.

I quote a few things from this folder. On one page is the statement:

There is a shortage—

That is followed by the following text:

The United States faces these shortages: 65,000 professional nurses, 9,200 dentists, 28,300 professional public health workers.

It is astonishing how precise they can be in their figures. Then they say:

We are short of doctors—

But they give no figures. This is a rather interesting folder dealing with the need. On another page appears this information:

Just to continue graduating 6,000 M. D.'s yearly, \$40,000,000 more is needed yearly to stay out of red, maintain high quality of instruction, plus \$330,000,000 for new buildings, labs, equipment.

Quoting further:

To increase enrollment 22 percent—working goal set by deans—would cost, in addition to above amounts, \$18,000,000 yearly for increased operations plus \$244,000,000 for construction and equipment.

I could go through the folder and point out many interesting things. The pages are not numbered. There is a little statement to this effect, under the heading "Key facts about S. 337—H. R. 2770":

It is limited to emergency needs for health personnel. It is a short-term, not a permanent program.

Anyone who has ever been associated with Government and has seen the initiation of a policy like this knows what will finally happen.

Let us get to the question of doctor shortages. I think one of the most revealing things that has come to my attention is an article which was contributed to the Reader's Digest by a man whom I esteem to be probably the best informed layman on medical subjects of whom I have any knowledge. Years ago I read with interest his book *The Microbe Hunters*. I also read his book entitled "The Hunger Fighters." He has been contributing to medical literature for a long time. His name is Paul de Kruif. This article, which he wrote for the June 1951 issue of the Reader's Digest, is rather interesting. It is so good that I think it ought to be read into the RECORD. This article covers the subject in a way which surpasses any capacity on my part. Paul de Kruif writes:

WHAT ABOUT THIS DOCTOR SHORTAGE?

(By Paul de Kruif)

"Our alarming doctor shortage"—so runs the title of a recent article in a national magazine. This shortage, we are told, is constantly becoming more critical. And the American Medical Association is the one big obstacle in the path of congressional efforts to meet that shortage with Federal aid to medical education.

Such incessant propaganda for socialized medicine, emanating in great part from the Federal Security Agency in Washington, has spread a false idea of the state of medical care in the United States.

"Mothers, lacking a physician's help," says the above-quoted article, "may die in childbirth. . . . Plagues and epidemics . . . may return to claim millions of victims."

Do such perils really lurk in our country whose doctors have made our maternal death rate lowest and our length of life longest of any big country in the world? Is there an alarming Nation-wide doctor shortage?

It depends on what you mean by doctors. It's true that, by going back 30 years, statisticians can prove we have a practically stationary supply of doctors: in 1920 one doctor for every 729 people; in 1950 one for every 730. That looks bad, until you dig down for why. What were those doctors of the good old days? Many thousands of them graduated from diploma-mill medical schools where, on payment of a sum of money and without even seeing a sick person, a boy in a couple of years could get his M. D.

Between 1909 and 1920 the medical profession led a campaign which rid us of rotten medical colleges. Now modern schools—all grade A—are graduating as many students as in the days when a quick M. D. could be bought for dollars. Our present institutions have increased their freshman medical classes during the past decade by an amount equivalent to the opening of 15 new medical schools, reports Dr. Stockton Kimball,

of the Association of American Medical Colleges.

Actually, since 1930 the number of doctors in the United States of America has been increasing proportionately faster than the general population. What is our situation compared to other lands? The United States has more doctors per total population than any country in the world, excepting Israel, overcrowded with refugee doctors from Europe.

Can we judge over-all need for doctors by simply counting doctors' noses? That's the yardstick used by Washington politicians. It's fishy. In World War II, 40 percent of our doctors were called into the armed services, leaving 60 percent of our M. D.'s to guard the lives of 91 percent of the population. What happened? During the war the Nation's health kept on improving, death rates sinking, life expectancy rising.

The fortunate fact is that 1 modern doctor can do what 10 couldn't do at all 30 years ago. In those days doctors ran themselves ragged treating diphtheria; immunization has wiped out that drudgery. Inoculations and new wonder drugs have enormously cut down the hours doctors used to have to spend at bedsides of children sick with whooping cough, measles, mastsoids, and other childhood ailments. Not long ago pneumonia meant weeks in hospital and day-and-night attendance by doctors; antibiotics have reduced this killer to a minor illness.

It's fantastic how constantly evolving miracles are saving time for doctors. Penicillin was wonderful the way it cut down long-drawn-out and often futile treatment of blood poisoning, peritonitis, syphilis, and gonorrhea. But penicillin still had to be injected, often around the clock. Now come antibiotics like aureomycin, chloromycetin and terramycin. Quickly conquering these maladies, and also virus pneumonia, urinary, and other infections untouched by penicillin, they save doctors still more time because they're given by mouth by nurses or members of the family under the doctor's direction.

It has become ridiculous to measure medical care in terms of a doctor per so many patients. Our lives are now guarded by crews of nurses, X-ray and laboratory technicians of which the doctors are the captains. These crews multiply each doctor's hands and brains in every hospital and clinic, speeding up and sharpening diagnosis. Helping doctors to spot diseases earlier, they vastly cut down the time required to treat them.

Thus, medical progress in the past 15 years has made statistical estimates of a national doctor shortage meaningless. Yet here is a grim fact: Many cities are overdoctored; in some rural regions the shortage is severe.

But this problem can be met—and is being met—by local action. Not many years ago young Dr. George F. Bond came to Bat Cave, N. C., to 500 square miles of mountain country most of whose 6,000 people had no medical care at all. Bond bumped about 175 miles a day by jeep, often working 20 hours out of 24. Dog-tired, treating people in their homes without hospital facilities, he was practicing bad medicine and knew it.

To do something about this, Dr. Bond and a board of mountain men got together. In Bat Cave there was next to no money. Some gave rocks, others lumber, others hardware, all of them manpower. In 9 months they had transformed an abandoned school into a 12-bed modern hospital.

In the past 2 years this little hospital has had 10,000 outpatient visits; has seen 600 accidents treated and 500 operations. In it 270 live babies have been born with no maternal deaths, and the newborn deaths are at the phenomenal low of 15 per 1,000 live births. Its surgical, medical and pediatric death rates compare favorably with those

of any large hospital in the United States of America.

Dr. Bond's story is a striking example of the way communities all over the country are tackling their own medical problems.

Merrillan, Wis., population 600, raised money for a doctor's home and clinic, bought an auto and put money in the bank subject to check till a practice would make expenses. Merrillan got its doctor. Fabius, N. Y., population 600, including surrounding farm families, remodeled a building into a home and clinic and gave it rent-free for a year. Got its doctor. Elk Horn, Iowa, less than 500 people, formed a community association, raised money for a little medical center. Got its doctor, who could purchase the center, if he chose, within a year. Fairfax, Mo., 800, raised \$105,000 in 3 weeks for a hospital. Before its completion, a doctor was attracted by the town's progressive action.

To Kansas in the past 2 years, 67 physicians have come to locate in towns of 2,500 or less. Dean Franklin Murphy, of the Kansas University School of Medicine, reports that a substantial number of these were attracted by the new community technique of building offices and clinics for their doctors.

By such methods, local shortages of doctors can be and are being relieved. And at present there is no serious national shortage. Yet from the Federal Security Agency comes a clamor that there will be such a shortage by 1960 unless medical schools increase their output of doctors by 50 to 100 percent.

But medical schools aren't mills into which the Federal Government can put dollars at one end and get highly trained doctors out the other. You can't expand medical schools by putting more chairs at the back of bigger rooms and having the professors talk a little louder. It takes 10 years of grueling medical education to turn out a modern doctor. It takes one teacher—and a good one—to every 15 or 20 students in the laboratory; in the clinics, one instructor for five students or ten. Where does the FSA expect to get the competent medical professors that would be needed to double the medical schools' output in 10 years?

Washington politicians have introduced a bill for Federal money to train doctors, and doctors representing some of the medical societies have fought this bill. That doesn't mean that they are against the sound expansion our medical schools need. Indeed, they are ready to go along with a law (like the Hill-Burton Act to help build hospitals) that will make Federal money available for new school facilities. But, having reason to dread bureaucratic control from Washington they want such funds to be one-time grants, controlled locally.

And they have started to back doctor-training with their own money. In December 1950 the American Medical Association announced its contribution of \$500,000 to the newly established American Medical Education Foundation. From doctors and other sources it is hoped that \$5,000,000 will be raised this year, to be given without strings to our medical schools.

The untapped sources for voluntary support of medical schools are numerous. The pharmaceutical and chemical industries make millions from the new drugs used by our doctors. By high pay they're taking the cream of the young teaching investigators out of medical schools. That way they endanger the seed corn of medical education. When they lure bright men from the colleges they ought to be willing to contribute the money to put new ones back.

In getting itself desperately needed new doctors, Mississippi, the poorest State in the Union, is putting all the rest of us to shame. It offers its college boys medical fellowships, \$5,000, to go to any medical school on condition they'll practice 5 years, after their internships, in doctorless areas of Mississippi

of their own choosing. Already 30 of these are practicing in small towns; 40 plan to enter rural practice this summer; 200 others, now enrolled in 24 medical schools, will follow them.

Even in Illinois, one of our richest States, there are rural regions short of doctors. Without Federal or State help, the Illinois State Medical Society and the Illinois Agricultural Association have formed a \$100,000 medical scholarship fund. Farmer-doctor committees pick promising boys from needy areas; 11 already are in medical school; during the next 5 years 15 will start medical training yearly. All will return to their home counties to practice.

By such local enterprise the plight of doctorless communities everywhere can be alleviated without the inefficiency and wastefulness of Federal dictation. Those who are crying for Federal help would do well to remember these words of Dr. A. C. Sudan, famed general practitioner of Colorado: "When a dollar stays in your community it's still a dollar, but when it first goes to Washington, it's diluted and trimmed, coming back to the community as a mighty small piece of change."

The continuing threat of socialized medicine has served one wholesome purpose. It has aroused State and local governments, civic and medical societies, to correct by local effort the deficiencies in our medical service. As a result, we are going to have plenty of good modern doctors. By 1954, medical graduates will have increased by 22 percent over 1940. By 1960, the year of the alarming shortage feared by Washington politicians, we'll have more doctors in proportion to population—and better ones—than we have today, and we already have more and better than any great nation has ever had before.

Mr. President, I wish to amplify a statement made by the author of this article. He says:

And at present there is no serious national shortage. Yet from the Federal Security Agency comes a clamor that there will be such a shortage by 1960 unless medical schools increase their output of doctors by 50 to 100 percent.

But medical schools are not mills into which the Federal Government can put dollars at one end and get highly trained doctors out of the other.

I believe that Paul de Kruif writes more authoritatively upon this subject than anyone else I know. He has examined it from stem to stern; and what he sets forth here is quite in line with the statement which was made recently by Dr. Anderson, which I shall subsequently place in the RECORD, and which also bears out pretty well the statement that there is no emergency shortage at the present time.

So, Mr. President, unless we are going to take the undiluted propaganda from the Federal Security Agency, there is much testimony and much authority, when we look realistically at the picture today, to the effect that there is no actual acute doctor shortage.

What we really have is a situation similar to that which once existed in the State of Kansas, where there was maldistribution of doctors. Dean Murphy, of the Kansas Medical School, addressed himself to that question long ago. Today Kansas is almost in the forefront in securing a better distribution of doctors as between metropolitan centers and rural areas. It has become a pioneer in that field. When the mal-

distribution of doctors was cured, much of the alleged shortage disappeared.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the fact that the Senator from Illinois mentions the State of Kansas and its fine program of rural health, as well as the expansion of its medical program within the State. I believe that the credit is due entirely to Dr. Franklin Murphy, who was dean of the medical school at that time, and who at present is chancellor of Kansas University, as well as to the Kansas Legislature, which took a very prominent part in supporting additional funds and appropriations which built for Kansas a greatly expanded medical program. I would recommend it to the other States of the Union. It is a program which can be carried out, and I think it is important, in view of the proposed legislation which is before the Senate at this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What the Senator from Kansas says is quite consonant with what my examination of that situation adduces. I am grateful for his contribution to the discussion.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. CARLSON. I believe there is one provision in the pending bill which should receive some consideration. I believe it follows along the line of a bill which was introduced in the House by Representative Bolton, of Ohio, to increase the expansion of the nursing profession. It is one of the difficulties we are facing in Kansas. It may be true that we have in some areas a shortage of doctors as well, but I believe we have taken care of that situation. It is the nursing field which is entitled to serious consideration. I hope we may have an opportunity in the future to consider legislation along that line.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall want to make some observations on that point as I go along.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I should like to say to my distinguished friend the Senator from Illinois that the history of the development of the medical services in the State of Kansas, as my colleague from Kansas has mentioned, has been due largely to Dr. Murphy's far-reaching attitude and understanding. I believe it is well to point out that Dr. Murphy saw the necessity of appearing before various groups in the State of Kansas, such as parent-teachers' associations, medical associations, county units, and various legislative groups, and selling the people on the idea that it was a local responsibility, and that the local communities ought to take action of a very positive character about the medical and health problems. It was through that approach that the enlarged medical program was developed. It was in that way that the communities in the State of Kansas got behind the program. In other words, it was put upon a State-based structure.

I believe it is most wholesome when communities and States realize their responsibilities. If the problem were presented to them we would find that there would not be need for this type of legislation, which, to my way of thinking, is the first step toward a socialized medical program. I think that Dr. Murphy has pointed the way, and I am very glad that the Senator from Illinois has made reference to the Kansas situation.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. In a moment I shall be glad to yield. I should like to read what Paul de Kruif had to say about the Kansas situation. He said:

To Kansas in the past 2 years 67 physicians have come to locate in towns of 2,500 or less. Dean Franklin Murphy, of the Kansas University School of Medicine, reports that a substantial number of these were attracted by the new community technique of building offices and clinics for their doctors.

I desire to point out also what he stated about the Illinois situation:

Even in Illinois, one of our richest States, there are rural regions short of doctors. Without Federal or State help, the Illinois State Medical Society and the Illinois Agricultural Association have formed a \$100,000 medical scholarship fund. Farmer-doctor committees pick promising boys from needy areas; 11 already are in medical school; during the next 5 years 15 will start medical training yearly. All will return to their home counties to practice.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Would the Senator from Illinois permit me to make an observation by reading an article which was written by Franklin D. Murphy, M. D., of the School of Medicine, University of Kansas, under the title, "We Need More Doctors"?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the article before me. If people were to talk to Dr. Murphy, I wonder if it would not be disclosed that in spite of the article he does not have some other ideas about it.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not say that Dr. Murphy has endorsed this particular bill, but he has pointed out that there is a shortage of doctors. Would the Senator mind my reading into the RECORD two short paragraphs from the article?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is quite all right for the Senator from Rhode Island to do so, because I have his article before me. It is from the Saturday Evening Post, I believe.

Mr. PASTORE. That is right. Dr. Murphy said:

The realization that our medical needs are growing faster than our medical manpower has been bothering many of us for several years. How big the deficit really is depends on who makes the estimate. The Medical Association, until recently, has denied the existence of a shortage and suggested we might be in for a surplus instead. Others have said it was simply a matter of uneven distribution of physicians.

Certainly poor distribution is part of the shortage problem, but it is not the whole problem. Nor is it necessarily the easiest part to solve. While some of the wealthier metropolitan areas undoubtedly have more doctors than they need and many rural regions don't have enough, you cannot order

city doctors into the country or coax them there by telling them about the birds and the trees. You must, as Minneola did, and as many other Kansas towns have done in the last 2 years did, add certain economic and professional elements to the atmosphere.

But over and above this faulty distribution there is, in the opinion of many medical educators, an absolute and substantial numerical shortage of trained medical personnel.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well. How many did Dr. Murphy say there were? He said it was a substantial number of doctors, and I started this discussion by saying that there has been an overemphasis of that point. I have before me a propaganda folder, which fixes the doctor shortage at from 15,000 to 22,000, according to the report made by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, chairman, Health Resources Advisory Committee of the NSRB. These figures are grabbed out of thin air in some agency in Washington. There is not any substance for any figures of that kind. It is a part of the overemphasis of the doctor shortage. I never said there was not a shortage. I said there was an amazing overemphasis on the question of the shortage, which does not stand up in the light of day.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I believe the discussion revolves around the question of Federal subsidies and scholarships.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from Illinois know of any shortage of applicants to medical colleges throughout the country?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am prepared to say that there are plenty of applicants, and that the situation can be taken care of by the medical schools.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. I have had some personal relationship with some of the medical colleges of the country, particularly the one in my own State. I know there are from 6 to 8 applicants for every available place in our medical college. There may be some duplication, of course. Those who apply to our school may also apply to other medical colleges. So the ratio in the over-all may not be that high. Only last week I was informed about a boy who was accepted for medical education by Ohio State University. I have been informed by the dean of the medical school that the boy had enlisted in the Army, and the Army refused to release him, on the ground that he was more valuable as a private in the Army than taking a medical course in Ohio State University.

During World War II thousands of boys were educated at Government expense. In the judgment of the Senator from Ohio—and I believe the junior Senator from Illinois agrees with me—we do not need any aid to the applicants, because there are plenty of applicants. What we need is increased educational facilities and increased enrollments in our medical colleges. We have increased our enrollments in the State of

Ohio from 35 to 150 for the freshman class, and ultimately it will reach 200. I think that is the answer to the problem, rather than the proposal being made in the bill which is now before the Senate.

As to the need for doctors throughout the country, I believe we should increase the educational opportunities in our colleges to the point where they can accept more students in the freshman class and have a little more Government cooperation in letting the boys get their own education, instead of trying to subsidize them.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. If I may answer the observation made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, I would say that that is exactly what the bill would do. It is not a grant to the student. It is merely a grant to the college, predicated on the number of students and also upon the number of students over and above the average for the past 3 years, so that they may increase their facilities and opportunities for more students to be admitted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is subsidized education.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course it is. I do not deny it.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator agree with me that the Federal Government is absolutely bankrupt at the present time and that the States are still solvent?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. I want to get to that point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was interested in the comments about the reference to subsidy. Am I to conclude from the observation made by the Senator from Illinois that he is opposed to the Federal Government in any way subsidizing education at the college level or at any other level?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am opposed whenever it is hooked up with authority and power which will give the Surgeon General of the United States and someone in the Security Agency authority to determine the program and finally move in with control in any field of education, whether it is at the secondary or at the primary level.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois be willing at this point to tell us a little about the land-grant colleges and the authority the Federal Government exercises in connection with them and in connection with the extension services of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes; but let me say to my naive friend from Minnesota that that has no relationship whatsoever to a social program to be carried out by the Government, in connection with which the President himself has gone down the line in the direction of socialized medicine, and in the budget for the fiscal year 1952 has requested a modicum

of money in order to initiate that program. The land-grant colleges and extension services have no relationship whatsoever to that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator from Illinois saying, then, that the deans of the medical colleges and the prominent doctors and prominent members of the American Medical Association and many highly skilled practitioners are endorsing a program of socialized medicine in this bill, which they have endorsed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I say that if a bill on any conceivable subject is introduced, in 2 hours' time I will be able to go out of the Capitol Building and obtain a list as long as the Senator's arm of persons who endorse that bill—any kind of a bill which may come along.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course the Senator from Illinois is aware that the State universities, which are supported by the taxpayers' funds, receive a subsidy from the American people. Does the Senator say he is opposed to having the taxpayers contribute to education?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I say that in that case the control lies in the States and in the local governments, and that is an entirely different thing.

My friend the Senator from Minnesota should read the whole delegation of power to the Surgeon General, beginning at page 38 of the bill, if the Senator from Minnesota has not refreshed himself about that point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I wish to continue with my remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that I am a cosponsor of the bill, and certainly I read the delegation provision. I not only read it, but I helped prepare it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, that is good; but of course on that point we disagree. [Manifestations of applause by the occupants of the galleries.]

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. The increase in the number of students has been mentioned. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Illinois is familiar—I am sure he is—with the fact that as late as September 8, of this year, one of the very reputable medical journals has stated that the 1950-51 freshman class totaled 7,182 students, that in 1951-52 there will be approximately 7,400 freshmen students, and that the total student enrollment of 26,191 presented in 1950-51 exceeded the 1949-50 enrollment by 1,088, or 4.1 percent, and exceeded the 1940-41 enrollment by 22 percent, or 4,812, the equivalent of the establishment of 15 new medical schools; and that the graduating class of 1951 was 6,135, the largest number in any year except in 1947, when under the accelerated war program several schools graduated two classes.

I ask the Senator if those figures show that there is an increase in the student

load and that very quickly the schools which wish to accept their responsibility will pick up the lag and make it unnecessary to have the pending proposal put into effect?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; and I point out that that has been done on a sure, steady basis, and it assures the American people competency when someone hangs out a shingle with "M. D." on it—and that is rather important, when "old sawbones" starts to stick some kind of a scalpel into one.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to point out that in my State we built a medical school and had it begin to function with approximately \$15,000,000 or \$18,000,000; and we did not have to borrow or turn to the Federal Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure that was done under the great Commonwealth of Ohio. [Manifestations of applause by the occupants of the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to admonish the occupants of the galleries that the rules forbid demonstrations of any kind. Those who are in the galleries are here as the guests of the Senate, and the Chair must request them to abide by the rules of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I reaffirm my first objection to the bill, namely, that the shortage which has been referred to has been overemphasized in the face of all the testimony. By following the normal course, the needs, whatever they may be, can be supplied.

My second objection is that here, again, it is proposed to expend Federal funds, at a time when there is such a tremendous burden upon the Federal budget—a debt of \$257,000,000,000, a spending budget this year in excess of \$71,000,000,000, and estimates for the spending budget next year of well over \$80,000,000,000.

Only last week we had the spectacle of having this body conclude its labors on the tax bill, on which the fight went back and forth across the aisle, and in regard to which some Members of the Senate felt that we were going to break the economic back of the country by putting such a burden upon our people, and, therefore, those Senators attempted to reduce the size of the tax bill, while other Senators, on the other hand, tried to increase the size of the tax bill from \$5,900,000,000, as reported by the Senate committee, to approximately \$9,000,000,000.

Now, we are asked to go blithely along and to put additional loads upon the budget and upon the backs of the people.

Mr. President, some months ago Senate bill 445 was under consideration in the Senate. I resisted it as best I could. I was defeated in that endeavor. I may be defeated in this one, but I intend to point out, insofar as I can, that, desirable though the programs may be, these constant accretions to the governmental burden are going to lead in the direction of national insolvency.

There is such a thing as taxing the solvency of the country, and the result of

such a program will be to take us down the dismal road down which Britain has gone.

Some have alleged that the program recommended by means of this bill is required by the increasing need for professional skills and the increasing cost of educating doctors, and it is claimed that similar factors have been the reasons for the developments we have witnessed in Great Britain. However, nothing could be further from the truth, as a matter of fact, because the British difficulties of today stem from the fact that within the British Government long ago the forces were set in motion, and today they have placed their feet in a dismal place, as they have socialized the productivity of their country, including their medical facilities. What has happened? A man like Cripps, when he became ill, went to Switzerland for medical treatment. I am not going to have that kind of thing happen to my own country.

So that is the sure and almost inevitable way of placing our country under wraps and under controls, which is just another name for socialism, because the very essence of socialism is control. It is done by the suicide route, which is the fiscal route.

So the question is, What is the cost? I have directed an inquiry along that line to the Bureau of the Budget, and the Bureau of the Budget has stated that the cost for the first year will be approximately \$60,000,000 or \$65,000,000. I have before me the break-down sheets which indicate what will be the cost of the program under this bill for a 5-year period. The total for the 5 years will be \$367,456,000. The total for the fiscal year 1952 will be \$60,932,000; the total for the fiscal year 1953 will be \$67,213,000; the total for the fiscal year 1954 will be \$74,233,000; the total for the fiscal year 1955 will be \$80,688,000; and the total for the fiscal year 1956 will be \$84,390,000.

How interestingly these amounts have an uncanny way of climbing and increasing until they become a real burden upon the country.

So there is the cost of this program—in the face of the fact that the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee stated on this floor some days ago that we were scraping the bottom of the barrel for taxes. However, now some are looking for new sources of taxation. Already we hear whispers. In addition to all the present burdens upon the American people, some persons are going to suggest that there be a Federal sales tax. Of course, the sales-tax field was almost exclusively the domain of the States in the days when the relief burden was heavy. Yet now some persons talk about a Federal sales tax. If it is imposed, it will not be in substitution for or in lieu of all the taxes which already are placed upon the people but it will be in addition to those taxes.

So the burden may be increased by means of every bill of this kind which comes before the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The question is whether we can afford it, even admitting that it might be desirable.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me at this point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. This bill proposes an approach for a 5-year period.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. The Senator from Illinois has just pointed out the cost factor each year for the 5 years. Does the Senator from Illinois have any idea or opinion to express as to what will happen at the end of the 5 years and what we shall do at that point after we have set in motion the machinery for this type of aid and assistance to be given to all the various institutions which would receive funds under the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I come to that now. First, Mr. President, let me recapitulate by saying that I am opposed to the pending measure because it rests upon an alleged shortage which has been definitely overemphasized. Secondly, it involves an over-all cost which becomes an added burden upon the country at a time when Members of the Senate who serve on the Senate Finance Committee are talking in terms of a \$20,000,000,000 or perhaps a \$10,000,000,000 deficit in the Federal budget in fiscal 1953.

I point out to my friend from Kansas that the third reason why I am opposed to the bill is that this program, like every other program of which I have had any knowledge, will grow. Such programs have an interesting way of snowballing. In this instance, while there is an estimate for 6,000 doctors a year, it will be observed that the figure will be built up, and there will be demands for additional funds for schools, additional funds for construction, and additional funds for equipment, as we go along.

Increased enrollment, according to the folder from which I have been quoting, was supposed to cost an extra \$18,000,000 over and above the \$40,000,000 estimated for the normal requirements under the program. There was an estimate of \$330,000,000 for buildings, and then it became larger. The propaganda folder which was issued says that to take care of this increased enrollment of 22 percent another \$244,000,000 will be required. All of that, Mr. President, mind you, is on the basis of preinflation figures. It is a good deal like some of the engineering estimates we get. I remember well that when I was a Member of the House, and I believe my esteemed friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] was also a Member, the Interior appropriation estimates for Hungry Horse Dam were sent to Congress. Does the Senator remember the Hungry Horse? What a Hungry Horse it was, because the estimate for the completion of the dam was \$6,500,000, and when we got through, Hungry Horse cost the Government \$91,000,000; and even the Hoover task report will verify that figure. So there will be more demands, other things to be thought of, and this program will grow and grow and grow.

The next reason for my opposition, Mr. President, is that there is present capacity for qualified students. I think

Dr. Anderson, who has done a great deal of work in this field, has pointed that out, and so, as the medical schools come to consider the student applications, I am confident they will be able to take care of them.

I desire to read a few excerpts from a statement made by Donald G. Anderson, M. D., secretary of the council on medical education and hospitals of the American Medical Association, formerly dean of the Boston University School of Medicine. This is in elaboration of what my friend from Kansas said a moment ago. Dr. Anderson says:

The average size of the freshman class in medicine in the 10 years preceding the recent war was 6,016. In 1948, 6,688 freshmen were admitted, the largest freshman class on record. The most recent estimate for 1949-50 indicates that the freshman class is slightly in excess of 7,000 students.

As a result of the increase in enrollment it is expected that the physician population of the United States will continue, as it has continued since 1929, to increase relatively more rapidly than the general population. In 1929 there were 125 licensed physicians per 100,000 persons in the United States. By 1948 the ratio was 137 licensed physicians for every 100,000 persons.

Mr. President, from all I have been able to put my finger on in connection with the proposals which are before the Senate in the pending bill, in my judgment there is every indication that there is present capacity, and that there will be normal enlargement from various sources and various funds, under the auspices of the States, so that the load can be taken care of.

Mr. President, there is one thing which has intrigued me about this subject. When all is said and done, we cannot put up buildings and admit extra students because there is a little subsidy to urge them to go forward and turn out doctors. There is something lacking. One of the things which is lacking of course is competent teachers, and there is a shortage of medical instructors at the present time. Medical students cannot be trained and qualified overnight. It is a rather happy idea that we can stick a freshman with a freshman cap on his head into a mill at this end and he automatically comes out as a competent physician. Nothing can be further from the truth, for there has to be sitting in front some one of professional rank, who has the capacity and the ability to make a good doctor out of the student.

Before too much is said about what is in the bill at the present time, perhaps a little more attention should be directed to that field.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does it occur to the Senator that one of the reasons why we have a shortage of faculty may be that there has been a tendency toward decline, a tendency toward closing up these departments, because of the difference between the cost of the tuition and the actual cost of the instruction? To me that would be indicative of an argument exactly contrary to that which is advanced by the distinguished Senator

from Illinois. If the medical schools have been keeping up with the progress of the time, if they have been developing their facilities and have been expanding, as the distinguished Senator from Kansas has pointed out, why then is it that we have a shortage of teachers?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Can my friend from Rhode Island find me a single shred of authority to fortify his conclusion that something in this bill is going to take care of it?

Mr. PASTORE. Of course it is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, I submit it is not.

Mr. PASTORE. It will take care of it because the minute we allow these schools to get a little more financial stability, so that they can afford to pay their teachers a little more money and attract more men into a profession from which possibly they have been drifting away, they may develop their faculties and thus make it possible to fill up any vacuum which may have been created over the years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the old story of the hen and the egg, and the question of which comes first.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course it is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So there will be a long lag during which it will not be possible to take care of the situation.

Mr. PASTORE. That is all right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why not start at the other end? Why not begin under State auspices, and let the deans about whom my friend from Rhode Island talks give some attention to that problem? And when we get around to it, probably the problems of inflation inherent in this bill will by that time have been taken care of.

Mr. PASTORE. Is not that to play Rip Van Winkle and go to sleep for 20 years, and to forget this big problem?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed not, and no one is forgetting it. Certainly the medical associations in the various States, the State universities, and the 77 medical schools in the country are not forgetting it. They are more alert to it at this time than they have ever been before, and as a matter of fact, they are just as alert as any one of the specialists or experts in the Federal Security Agency, which has been doing so much for this bill, or in the Public Health Service of the United States.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not a fact that practically all of the representatives of the 79 schools have come here to say that unless they get this help they cannot do the things they want to do?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is rather interesting to me that all these citizen groups and professional groups in this folder are very careful and very restrained in the kind of endorsement they make. They say they support the principle of Federal aid to train more medical personnel. That is one thing, but do they go so far as it is proposed to go in this bill at the present time?

Mr. PASTORE. Would the Senator accept Dr. Conant, of Harvard, as an authority on it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know that I would or that I would not. Having

noticed what Dr. Conant has had to say about various Federal programs in the past, including universal military training, I doubt whether I would accept him as an authority on it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. CARLSON. I merely am wondering whether the distinguished Senator from Illinois would agree with me that even to increase the number of doctors in this way would not care for a situation which has developed in the Nation, namely, the difficulty of securing the services of physicians and doctors in rural areas. Something more will be required than simply additional doctors. I think we must have a program such as Dr. Murphy inaugurated in Kansas, of giving to young doctors as they graduate from school some assistance in the way of clinics, hospitals, and offices, to encourage them to practice in the rural areas. We have demonstrated in the State of Kansas that that can be done. It is not so much a question of scarcity of doctors as it is a question of local assistance to induce doctors to go to the rural areas.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to answer my friend from Rhode Island with respect to the capacity and willingness of States to do the job.

The State University of New York announces plans for two new science centers, one at Brooklyn and one at Syracuse. The Brooklyn structure will cost \$10,500,000, and the Syracuse structure will cost \$4,500,000, plus large sums for equipment.

The Nebraska University voted increased funds for the Nebraska Medical School so that service might be restored.

In Washington legislation for Federal aid for medical schools has been introduced, but objection has been raised three times when efforts have been made to act upon it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. In the State of Rhode Island there is no medical school.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator's State is so conveniently located to the Empire State and to the whole Atlantic seaboard, that even though Rhode Island is a small State, there should be plenty of doctors and there should be no difficulty in getting doctors into the State.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Illinois says that too easily. The fact still remains that it has been possible to place in medical schools less than 5 percent of those who have received a premedical education.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then let me ask, What is the matter with the people of Rhode Island?

Mr. PASTORE. Nothing is the matter with the people of Rhode Island.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I begin to doubt it.

Mr. PASTORE. The fact of the matter is that we do not have a medical school and we cannot build one, with costs as they are today. The people of the State of Rhode Island pay \$215,000,000 in Federal taxes and receive only \$8,000,000 in grants.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is progress in every other State in the Union, including the State of Mississippi, which is the lowest taxpayer in the country, I believe. The State of Mississippi has made excellent progress in recent years. It is a confession of weakness back home to throw upon the Federal Government the task of providing the educational facilities sought by the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. I am not throwing it on the Federal Government. When the Senator cites the fact that facilities are being constructed in New York, that might not mean anything to someone in California or in Illinois. Even in States where there are medical schools they do not have the facilities to take care of all the young men and young women who desire to attend medical school. In 1918 4,100 medical students were graduated, and today approximately 5,700 are graduated. We have not kept up with the demands of the times.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is, to me, a rather baffling argument. Nearly every State in the Union takes care of the need. My friend says that the State of Rhode Island pays \$215,000,000 to the Federal Government in taxes. Where is the will of the people of Rhode Island? Why bring the problem here?

Mr. PASTORE. This bill does not solve the Rhode Island problem. It is a national problem, which cannot be confined to a particular State.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, my next objection to the bill is that it puts too much power into the hands of the Surgeon General of the United States. The bill speaks for itself. I think that is one of the alarming features of the measure.

On page 38, under the heading "Authorization of appropriations for grants for construction and equipment," section 373 provides, in part, as follows:

There are also authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1956, \$10,000,000, to enable the Surgeon General to make grants.

I read further:

The Surgeon General, after obtaining the advice and recommendation of the Council, shall make such grants in the order of the estimated importance or value of the construction and equipment in alleviating the shortage of personnel adequately trained in the medical, osteopathic, nursing (other than practical nursing), dental, dental hygiene, and public-health fields: *Provided, however,* That the Surgeon General shall give priority to areas in which facilities are either nonexistent or inadequate.

That is where the delegation of authority to the Surgeon General starts.

I invite attention to the language on page 40 of the bill, in section 374:

SEC. 374. (a) No payments from appropriations pursuant to section 372 for any fiscal year may be made to any school unless such school has filed an application therefor for such year which contains adequate assurance, as determined by the Surgeon General, that—

(1) such school provides and will provide reasonable opportunity for the admission of out-of-State students.

There are 15 universities or medical schools which in the school year 1950-51 did not admit a single nonresident

student, yet it is proposed to give the Surgeon General power to say, "Look, I am authorized to withhold any aid from you unless you follow the regulation or directive or ukase in a way consonant with what I say about the admission of nonresident students."

Incidentally, Mr. President, those schools include the Medical College of Alabama, the University of Arkansas, the Medical College of Georgia, the University of Mississippi School of Medicine, the University of Missouri School of Medicine, the University of North Carolina School of Medicine, the Ohio State University School of Medicine, the University of Oklahoma School of Medicine, the Medical College of South Carolina, the University of Tennessee College of Medicine, the Southwestern Medical School of the University of Texas, the University of Texas School of Medicine, and the University of West Virginia School of Medicine.

Let us consider the language on page 41 of the bill. Among the other powers the Surgeon General will have in pursuance to delegation of power under this bill is this:

Such school will submit from time to time such reports as the Surgeon General may reasonably require to carry out the purposes of this part.

There is something fancy about that word "reasonably." When we get into a difficulty we stick in the word "reasonably," and it seems to cover a multitude of sins.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Will not the very point which the Senator is making build up such dependence upon Washington for financial support that there will be an anxiety on the part of those in charge of the schools to please Washington authorities, and we shall certainly lose the intellectual independence and freedom which belong in those institutions? Does the Senator agree with me on that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if it would not be a good thing for the Surgeon General to have authority to require the admission of a certain number of out-of-State students. The thought occurred to me because in my own State we have two very good and long-established medical schools, while in the State of Mississippi there is only one medical school, an institution which has not been in existence nearly so long as ours, and which does not have anything like the facilities possessed by our schools.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that if he will examine the bill, starting with page 33, and spell out the powers vested in the Surgeon General, he will see that we give him many powers.

Finally, the school must be approved by a recognized body, and the Surgeon General will approve the body that does the approving. So, when we consider the total of the authority and power

delegated, we find we are asked to hand to the Surgeon General a large chunk of authority over the medical schools of the country.

Mr. President, I wish to add one further statement. What is proposed to be done by the bill will be permanent; let no one fool himself about that. The camel gets his nose under the tent, and then, of course, as time goes on, the demands increase tremendously. I have seen that follow, and all other Members of this body have seen it, at one time or another.

I discover on reading the report issued by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or issued at its instance, which relates to Federal scholarships, Federal programs, and other Government aids to institutions, that there is envisaged an ultimate permanent Federal-aid program, and when it is integrated, when it has dug in, it will be here for all time to come.

Mr. President, I remember the nursing program we set up during the war, when I was a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. When the time came to liquidate the program I thought those in charge of it would tear out the heart of every member of the Appropriations Committee. Telegrams rolled in from my State by the hundreds. Those in charge had done a masterly job of propagandizing the thing, and were fairly threatening our political lives unless we went down the line and agreed to continue the program and to continue in power those in charge of it.

Let me prove to the Senate that the program is going to be permanent and that the demand for its continuation will be with us. Here is an interesting pamphlet, an effective hunk of propaganda: "Emergency doctors wanted." Who signs it? The American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Cooperative Health Federation of America, the Cooperative League of the United States, the Committee for the Nation's Health.

Let 5 years go by, and let the appropriation of money under this program terminate, and those in charge will be here just as strong as ever, demanding that the program not only be continued, but that it be enlarged.

Mr. President, probably out of your experience you can testify to the accuracy of the statement I am about to make. It runs in my mind that when Senator Smoot, of Utah, was a Member of this body he once said, long ago, that there is never a recession from the higher spending plateau to the lower. It is always onward, upward, forward. It is always more and more, and in greater quantities. So once this program has been bottomed up, it will be simply the springboard for greater and greater demands for this field, including larger slices of authority in a Federal bureaucracy as it articulates its power, coupled with money. And, oh, what a lure there is to come with their tin cups even as suppliant nations from abroad come to this country for gratuities, loans, and hand-outs.

Mr. President, when I think of the need of this measure, my mind goes back

to Senate bill 445, which was debated on the floor of the Senate some months ago. It was finally passed by a few votes. But as I go back and think about it, I recall what was involved in that case. There were statements made on the floor of the Senate that it would cost—"Oh, only fifteen or twenty million dollars." I had to read the Record, because it had become a little vague in the minds of some of the Members of the Senate, that the estimate was \$80,000,000 for the Federal Treasury and \$160,000,000 for the State and local treasuries for that bill, a total of \$240,000,000. But voices were raised on the floor of the Senate that it would only cost fifteen or twenty million dollars. It was said, "After all, in a sixty-billion-, seventy-billion-, or eighty-billion-dollar budget, what is that? It is a mere bagatelle."

What was being asked for under that bill? Three thousand public-health physicians, 30,000 public-health nurses, 7,500 sanitarians. That is a new word. In response to questions asked by Senator Pepper, of Florida, I think Dr. Scheele—it may have been someone else—said, "Well, it is only for some service. This country should have more. Maybe 60,000 or maybe 70,000 persons." Where does this business stop finally, I should like to know?

So here we have a program the estimates for which run up to well over \$300,000,000 for a 5-year period, of what will become a permanent program. Is it not time, in view of the fiscal situation that confronts the country, to stop, look, and listen? I think the sensible thing to do with the bill is to send it back to the committee. If some construction funds have to be voted, let them be thinking about it. But let us be careful with respect to the kind of authority we delegate, because bureaucracy has moved pretty far in this field, and has frightened many who have had to go back to the people for the suffrage that returns them to this and to other elective bodies.

That is all I have to say, Mr. President, except to reassert that even if this program were desirable, it contains so many objectionable features that it ought to be looked at pretty carefully before we go any further down the road it opens up. Nursing bills, public health bills, aid to schools—put them all together, draw the line, and add up, and the result is a little more steady progress down the road that Britain traversed, the road of free teeth and nothing to bite with them when the people get those teeth, free wigs, free medicine, and all that goes with it, on a level and on a basis that compelled their own Prime Minister to go to Switzerland in order to find the kind of medical service that he thought was consonant with his rather critical condition.

Mr. President, I shall not wittingly add my voice or my vote to a single proposition that is going to take my country in that direction.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, this particular bill has been so much commented upon today, both pro and con, that there is not a great deal left to be said that has not heretofore been expressed. But

I start out in my discussion, Mr. President, with the statement that last year 20,000 young men in the United States could not take courses in medicine or dentistry for the reason that there was no room in the schools to accommodate them. I reiterate the statement that the schools are crowded now. They would take more students today if they had the available faculty, if they had the available laboratory space, if they had the increased facilities. Let me say that there is no desire on the part of any medical or any dental school or any school of nursing in the United States to attempt to keep young people from studying those professions; but many young people are prevented from doing so simply because the schools are crowded, and they cannot take any additional students.

Mr. President, here is another startling statement. In 1905—and that was 46 years ago—512 more physicians were graduated in the United States than were graduated in 1949, 512 more physicians in 1905 than in 1949.

Here is another statement, Mr. President. We have in the United States today approximately between 75 and 78 less medical schools than we had in 1905. I happen to be one of those who are pleased that a great many of those medical schools have passed out of the picture, for they were simply diploma mills. It is good for the practice of medicine and dentistry that they were closed when the survey was made, I believe in 1910.

I have spoken of the number of graduates as of 1905 and as of 1949. At the same time I call attention to the fact that the population of the United States has doubled in that time. Carrying these statistics just a little further, in 1905 there were 2,677 more medical students than there were in 1949. In 1949 there were 2,677 fewer students in the United States taking medicine than there were in 1905, although our population had doubled. Today the population of the United States is increasing at the rate of between 6,500 and 7,000 persons a day. That is approximately 2,500,000 people a year. So there must be, and is, a terrific load on our medical schools to produce the number of physicians, the number of dentists, and the number of nurses which are absolutely essential in order to meet the needs of the increased population.

Something has been said today about the fact that at present 1,600 hospital beds under the Veterans' Administration are vacant because there are not enough physicians and medical technicians to supply the services for those beds, so that they might be utilized by our servicemen. I am wondering if it is surprising to Senators when I say that in perhaps one of the best hospitals in the city of Washington half of the surgical ward is closed today, and has been closed for some time, because of lack of medical and technical personnel and nurses to supply that particular ward.

There is another item which enters into the increased need for medical education. Today people realize more than ever before the value of medical care. Today people have more of the necessary

finances to take advantage of medical assistance and medical care than they have ever had before in the history of the United States. So we find a situation in which the services of professional people, physicians, dentists, and nurses, are in greater demand than they have ever been before in the United States. Ten years ago 7,000,000 people in the United States availed themselves of the use of hospital beds. Last year nearly 18,000,000 were patients in our various hospitals.

Another situation facing us today is the fact that a great many physicians, dentists, and nurses are going into the Armed Forces. For the first time in the history of the country it was necessary to resort to the draft of professional personnel, physicians and dentists, in order to obtain a sufficient number to take care of the members of the armed services. In some ways I have no criticism of either a physician or a dentist who does not care to avail himself of an appointment as first lieutenant. After he has put in 4 years in high school, 4 years in college, and then 4 years in medical school or dental school, and in the case of a physician, at least 1 year of postgraduate work, he is offered a first lieutenancy. Of course he should not be called upon to accept appointment to such a low rank in the armed services. The money he has spent and the time he has put in entitle him to a far better classification than that of first lieutenant or captain in the armed services.

I should like to cite an incident which happened year before last. A friend of mine telephoned me in an attempt to get his boy into Georgetown University Medical School. I telephoned the school, and this is what I was told: "Senator, we would like to help you. We can take only 125 students. We have 3,600 applications."

That situation does not prevail exclusively with Georgetown University. It holds true throughout all the United States. I am interested in the situation because of the deplorable condition in my own State. We do not happen to be sufficiently fortunate to have a medical school or a dental school. In fact, the 10 Rocky Mountain States do not have a dental college. From the Canadian border to the Mexican boundary 10 States, with a population of 10,000,000 people, have no dental school. They have two medical schools, one rather large one and one rather small one. So the people of that Rocky Mountain area must depend on the charity of other States in taking students from the Rocky Mountain area.

The great need for this bill, as I see it, lies primarily in the lack of well-trained faculties of instructors. There was a time in medical education when it was considered a great honor, and was considered helpful in practice building, to be a professor in a university, to be a dean, or be the head of one of the departments of a medical school or dental college. Today, however, the schools are not in a position to pay anything near the amount of money which a physician or doctor can earn in private practice. Therefore physicians and dentists do

not respond to the requests of the dental and medical schools to give of their time and talent in teaching. At the present time I am in the process of attempting to get a Japanese dentist to come to the city of Baltimore and accept a position in the dental college in that city, simply because sufficient personnel cannot be obtained in the city of Baltimore or in the State.

Another great need—and this bill is not adequate in that direction—is the need for new structures. As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, the schools cannot take any additional students today. They simply do not have room for them. So this bill makes \$10,000,000 available each year for a period of 5 years, to be allocated to various schools to increase their physical facilities.

The yearly average deficit of our medical and dental schools today is \$40,000,000. That is, the income from student fees is \$40,000,000 less than the expense of educating the students. I hear various statements with reference to the cost of medical education a year, ranging all the way from \$2,000 up to \$3,500. I believe that an accurate figure is somewhere near \$3,000. Since the student pays a \$600 fee for tuition, naturally there is a deficit created by each and every student; and the more students there are the greater the deficit.

Mr. President, without a doubt we in the United States have the best schools in the world. The medical and dental profession and the nursing profession in the United States are far ahead of those in any other country. There was a time when it was considered necessary to go to Vienna to complete one's education in medicine and surgery. But such is not the case now. Our schools are looked upon as the very best in the world.

Mr. President, I have before me a memorandum with reference to the pending bill, which I believe came to me from the American Medical Association. It is entitled "Problems Involved in Considering the Support of S. 337."

I wish to make brief references to the various statements contained in the memorandum.

First, it states the fear that when medical schools are financed by Federal funds, the independence and intellectual freedom of medical schools may be threatened. In other words, "He who pays the piper, calls the tune."

I understand the apprehension of the American Medical Association along that line, and I know, too, that they feel that this may be the first step toward socialized medicine. There is no Member of this body who is more opposed to socialized medicine as is the junior Senator from Wyoming. I do not believe that this bill is at all a step in the direction of socialized medicine.

I know that another fear of the medical profession is that the passage of the bill would give some control to a Federal bureau over the curriculum, over the course of study, and over the naming of students.

Since 1878 we have been contributing funds directly from the Federal Treasury to land-grant colleges. To the best of my knowledge the Federal Govern-

ment has not attempted to dictate to the schools throughout the United States what they shall teach or who the pupils shall be.

Another situation was referred to on the floor of the Senate the other day. Congress willingly contributes to the support of agricultural schools. Oh, yes, Mr. President, we are willing to contribute toward teaching a farmer how to raise wheat, how to produce better livestock, how to treat the conditions of his livestock, and how to take care of his livestock, but again when it comes to the human being, there are those who oppose our making like contributions toward taking care of the health of the people of the Nation.

I note another reason why the AMA is disturbed about this bill. It states that the basic operating expenses of the medical schools vary so much that possible economies might be considered in some of the medical schools.

Of course some of the medical schools could operate on lower expenditures, but I contend that when we start to cut the expenses of the medical schools we immediately reduce the standards of those schools. That is something that none of us wants to see happen, namely, a cutting of the standards of instruction and practices of the profession.

The next objection seems to be that financial assistance for the medical schools either should come from the States or from private funds, thus leaving the schools with less centralized Federal control. Campaigns for raising such funds are being conducted at present.

The American Medical Association is right. President Hoover is trying to raise a fund to assist medical schools, and I understand the fund is to be \$5,000,000. However, I ask, what is \$5,000,000 toward a \$40,000,000 annual deficit?

The American Medical Association has made a gesture toward raising a fund to help medical schools. They talk about raising a half million dollars. I do not believe they mean to raise that much each year. I ask again, what is a half million dollars as against a \$40,000,000 annual deficit?

Something has been said today with reference to the increased number of students graduating from medical schools. There has been reported a 22-percent increase between 1941 and 1948. I know that the medical profession and especially the medical schools are doing everything they can to increase the output of physicians; but, with an increase in population of about two and a half million each year, and taking into consideration the doctors who are forced out of the profession by reason of health, death, retirement, and for other reasons, the number is not sufficient to take care of the load.

The bill does provide subsidies. I know of no other way in which the Federal Government can help.

Then the argument is presented that although there is a time limitation of five years specified in the proposed legislation, it is improbable that this will ter-

minate the program as subsidies once started are difficult to stop.

With that statement I am in complete agreement. I am inclined to think that if we start subsidizing medical schools, in all probability we shall continue to do so.

Certainly I know of no worthier activity that taxpayers could subsidize than our medical schools.

Mr. President, I am thinking of the GI bill of rights. For some 6 years now the Federal Government has been subsidizing our colleges and universities in order to take care of the ex-serviceman, so that his education could be completed. I do not know of any instance in which the Federal Government has attempted to dictate to the schools what they shall teach, how they shall teach, or who should receive the instruction.

I should like to say for the RECORD that this bill has the strong endorsement of the American Dental Association.

I have in my files a letter from the Secretary of the National Association of Deans of Medical Colleges, stating that the medical colleges strongly support this bill.

I feel that Congress has an obligation to the young men and young women of the country. I feel very keenly that a young man who wants to take medicine or dentistry in the United States should have that right, just as we make it possible for any young man to take law, education, agriculture, or any other study he may care to take. I know of no type of instruction today which is not available to all of our young people, with the exception of medicine and dentistry.

I am very hopeful, Mr. President, that this bill will receive favorable action by the Senate.

THE WAR IN KOREA

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington wishes to talk about the war in Korea.

In the press of last night, I found a comment by General Omar Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which ought to be made a part of the record and called to the attention of the Nation by every possible means. This is what was said:

WITH UNITED STATES THIRD DIVISION IN KOREA, Tuesday, October 2.—Gen. Omar N. Bradley said today the United Nations could bring the Korean war to a successful "military conclusion" if the suspended truce talks break off completely.

He did not elaborate on what was implied in the phrase "military conclusion."

Mr. President, I take it for granted that General Bradley thought that any elaboration of the phrase "military conclusion" was unnecessary. He must have considered the meaning of the phrase to be obvious. All he could have meant was that the United Nations forces are prepared and will be determined, if the cease fire talks are called off, to unify Korea by military means. What else could General Bradley have meant? Everybody has known for months that a "military conclusion" could never be achieved by having the opposing forces kill each other on or about the thirty-eighth parallel. That procedure can

pile up casualties and might result in reaching an agreement to temporarily stop fighting, but it could never lead to a "military conclusion" or decision by ourselves or the enemy.

General Bradley said yesterday what nobody else in authority has even intimated for almost a year. He implied in his phrase "military conclusion" that we are prepared to exercise sufficient pressure to make the enemy lay down his arms and withdraw from North Korea. Mr. President, can any other possible construction be given to General Bradley's comment of yesterday?

I do not know, of course, by what authority General Bradley spoke. Perhaps he meant only to provide the officers and troops of the Third Division, fighting now in Korea, with some encouragement. It might be that General Bradley did not intend to have his comment made public in the United States. I can only hope that General Bradley meant what he said, and that he was authorized by the United Nations to make his comment.

Because of what General Bradley has said could and would be undertaken if the truce talks fail, our Nation should be advised of what is likely to happen in the near future.

If the truce talks fail completely, one great and inspiring thing is certain to follow: We shall have heard the last of Operation Killer. We shall be given an opportunity to support, for a change, Operation Victory.

The Korean war has been characterized for months as being Operation Killer. The Senator from Washington resents and resists that slogan today as much as he has since first he heard it several months ago. War's only objective is victory—not death, destruction, and bloodletting. There is no justification for any war which does not have victory as its primary purpose. Operation Killer implies that we Americans and our allied associates are engaged in an effort which is not designed to carry out our political objective in Korea by military means, but is designed to kill as many North Koreans and Red Chinese as we can. This concept of war is repugnant to those who think, and is a complete contradiction of the convictions and faith by which Christians live and die.

Operation Killer is a slogan which is being used by the enemy's propaganda corps to do the cause of freedom grievous injury everywhere. It could have been selected only because our military people have been led to believe that no plan for victory in Korea had been agreed to or designed by the United Nations, including the United States. The crying need of the present, Mr. President, is for an Operation Victory. I hope we initiate such a plan, and do it soon. If the free world, as represented by a limited number of allied nations now fighting in Korea, is unable to collectively agree on how victory can be achieved in Korea, then those nations, if common sense and consideration for those who now are fighting and bleeding in Korea mean anything at all, ought to get out of Korea. No good purpose is being served

by letting blood run thick on and about the thirty-eighth parallel.

Gen. Omar Bradley is apparently convinced that the United Nations must decisively defeat the enemy if that enemy will not promptly agree to a cease fire. Gen. Matthew Ridgway, the Allied Supreme Commander, has stated that the Eighth Army is ready and poised "to strike and strike hard." We lay persons ought to appreciate what these statements by our leading military authorities really mean. What they must mean is that at long last the free nations of the world are getting ready to support and carry out what they said they meant to accomplish in Korea more than 15 months ago. It likewise means that young Americans and their counterparts from other allied nations will be given a chance to live and die in pursuit of a worth-while mission. It means that the agony coming out of frustration and futility and a lack of purpose or objective in Korea may soon be over and done with. It means that the forces of freedom will try again to regain their self-respect. It means that these free forces will seek to be deserving once again of the admiration and confidence of the unfortunate victims of Communist despotism everywhere.

If the cease-fire talks break down completely—and that might happen tomorrow or this afternoon—it must naturally follow that enemy bases in his Manchurian sanctuary will be attacked and destroyed. It must follow also that allied forces in sufficient number will be committed on the ground to force the enemy to retire north of the Yalu River. It must also follow that consideration is being given now in allied high councils to increasing the effectiveness of economic sanctions and to establishing for the first time, 15 months after the war began, a naval blockade against Red China. General Bradley, a distinguished soldier and a man possessed of a thinking brain, and everybody else who knows anything about war, fully understand that all of these means must be employed if a successful military conclusion is to be reached in Korea.

For a long time, Mr. President, my impression has been that the pattern of the war in Korea has not changed since the Joint Chiefs of Staff advised General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, in late December of last year, that his primary mission was Japan, not Korea; that he could expect no reinforcements from the United States or from our allies; that the enemy would be permitted to do as he liked from the security of his Manchurian bases; and that no use could be intended for the Chinese Nationalist troops on Formosa. Until General Bradley spoke out yesterday, none of us had been given, in recent months, any possible reason to believe that we had any other plan or intention in mind than Operation Killer.

That our political management of the war in Korea has violated every sound military doctrine developed in all of history, is well known to everybody; and no witness can be produced on the face of the earth to say otherwise. There is nothing very much that any of us can do about past blunders and political mis-

management. All we can pray for is that General Bradley knows what he is talking about, and that we are shortly, if honorable cease-fire terms are not agreed to, to forget the mistakes of the past, in favor of going forward until a true and valid peace has been restored to all of Korea.

Mr. President, as we prepare ourselves for the changes which are likely to take place soon in Korea, and to be imposed upon our Nation, there are some facts we ought to think about and bear in mind. During the long-drawn-out weeks of the cease-fire negotiations, the casualty rates have been skyrocketing. We are inclined to be so impressed with published enemy casualty losses that we are too unmindful that in war you do not kill the enemy without suffering important losses of your own. In the last several weeks the casualties in Korea have been comparable to the highest weekly casualties suffered since the Korean war began over 15 bloody months ago. Every American who has thus far been led to believe that Operation Killer is worth while ought to cry out in holy horror over the bloody fact that we have suffered more casualties in the first 15 months of the administration's police action than we suffered during the first 15 months in World War II.

Mr. President, we ought to learn again how to become indignant. In World War II our casualties for the first 15 months were 80,620, with 6,860 grand, young, gallant Americans dead on foreign battlefields. In the Korean war—to which I have never from the beginning referred as a police action—casualties for a like period were 85,469 Americans, with 14,280 killed in action. In an undeclared war, in 15 months there have been killed more than twice the number who died in a comparable period in a war which at least was recognized for what it was by the administration and by the Congress of the United States.

If this knowledge does not make the living flesh of every American crawl, as it makes my own hair stand on end, then from my point of view that individual has no right to call himself an American, for he is possessed of neither heart nor soul nor conscience.

Unless an honorable cease-fire is agreed to, or unless the United States will forget Operation Killer in favor of demanding and supporting "Operation Victory," let someone else tell me what I do not see, for I see no conceivable end in sight of the war in Korea. The war there has already lasted longer than American participation in actual combat in World War I. The Korean war is now headed straight into its second winter. I must believe that General Bradley, who has a heart and, I think, a conscience, and others in authority will not permit Operation Killer to be the only hope and the only goal to be offered to the allied forces in the winter to come.

All of us know that arms and equipment and the instruments for making war are being sent in vast quantities to areas of the world where there is no war. We have all realized for a long time that equipment and personnel strength in the quantity required for success have been held back from the only and actual war

in which Americans are dying and have suffered so grievously. Small wonder that the Senator from Washington must conclude that General Bradley means that there is to be an end to these diversions if the cease-fire talks are broken off permanently in Korea.

The President talks to our Nation about new and fantastic weapons. I think him ill-advised to talk about instruments which are mostly on the drawing boards; but he talks, too, on many occasions about atomic weapons. We are told that they are being stockpiled in great numbers. We have been led to believe that they are superweapons in themselves. Yet not a single bomb from our stockpile has been employed as a tactical weapon in Korea, where more than 14,000 Americans will never again be given a chance to come home to this land of the free and the home of the brave, because they are dead. It is for the dead that I do my best to speak this afternoon. In his phrase "military conclusion" Gen. Omar N. Bradley must have included a consideration of employing atomic energy for tactical reasons if we soon get rid of Operation Killer in favor of Operation Victory.

I remember, Mr. President, when the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of State and the President of the United States last January, which was 9 months ago, decided that the time had come to pursue attacking enemy aircraft to where those aircraft had taken off from their sanctuary in Manchuria, and destroy them. Those who read the newspapers of that day and who listened to the radio will remember when that decision was made. But that decision was not made effective, and there are those who have never been told why. That decision was not made effective because some of our allies opposed our intention, and because our Secretary of State—and I make no possible reference to him as a person, but I refer to him as one of the most powerful officials on the face of the earth was singularly ineffective in his lukewarm effort to convince our allies of the righteousness of our intention and positive need for such action. During the hearings held by the Joint Committee on the Military Situation in the Far East, some of us sought a logical answer as to why military necessity and common sense did not demand that the enemy's aircraft be destroyed. I learned in those hearings, Mr. President, that the war in Korea was, and is to this minute, being managed not by military but by political leaders. I do not waste any time in castigating our Secretary of State. I am simply against him, and I believe that he ought to be removed, not for any personal reasons, for I hold him to be cultured and well-mannered, gracious and considerate. Those considerations are unimportant. But I think the Secretary of State ought to be removed because of the testimony he gave under oath in the hearings on the question of hot pursuit and other military matters. When we consider that the Secretary of State has largely dictated the course of action which we have followed in Korea, other Senators may be as shocked and disappointed as I was by some of his

observations about the question of hot pursuit.

I asked him first:

Can you suggest a single logical military reason why enemy aircraft whose sole mission is to destroy and hinder allied operations should not be shot out of the air wherever they are found?

The Secretary of State responded:

Well, I can suggest the reasons which were given at the time of this proposal was brought up for believing that it might be more of a disadvantage than it is an advantage, and that is that if by pursuing an airplane across the border you bring in the air on the other side against your whole operation you may have lost more than you have gained.

I pursued this question with the Secretary of State a little further by saying this to him:

That was not the thinking, however, of the Military Establishment and the Joint Chiefs of Staff as of the time last January when you, after agreeing with their contentions, were directed to inform our allied members of what the intention of the military people in the United States was.

Secretary ACHESON. You did not ask me that. You asked me if I could think of any reason—

Senator CAIN. Yes, sir.

Secretary ACHESON (continuing). And I was trying to think of a reason, in answer to your question.

Senator CAIN. Mr. Secretary, in the name of continuity and in the name of just common sense, I want the record to support in a limited way my contention that there is every possible military reason for hot pursuit of enemy aircraft in any war in which America finds itself engaged. I use three brief references from military witnesses.

On page 28, General MacArthur said:

"I know that the air wished from the very beginning to pursue an attacking enemy plane to the death, whether it was over the border or not. The directives forbade that. The question was raised at the very beginning whether we could pursue an attacking plane to a conclusion in an air fight."

On page 807 General Marshall, Secretary of Defense, said with reference to hot pursuit:

"I had urgently recommended it and it was concurred in by the Secretary of State and the President."

On page 2300, General Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said this:

"From a military point of view we thought it was desirable because it would be tough for a man in a dogfight to keep one eye on the Yalu River and stop the minute he gets there. It is very difficult."

The Secretary of State and others highly placed in the administration have endeavored to make us forget the monstrous political mismanagement of the war in Korea by turning our attention to other things.

At least we have not heard that anyone representing the administration has dared to take the floor of the Senate, or the floor of the House of Representatives, and say a scintilla favorable thing about the political management of the war in Korea which began in June 1950, for a statement of that kind is impossible.

I am reminded of what the President said about the Secretary of State immediately after the Japanese Peace Treaty had been signed in San Francisco. The President said that the Sec-

retary of State, by his superb conduct as a chairman at the peace conference and as a designer of an agenda which had already been agreed to before the conference was convened, had proved himself to be smarter than all of his critics combined. If this be true, Mr. President, all of us have the greatest possible reason for concern about the future.

The Secretary of State is that individual who, in the face of sound military judgments advanced by those in military authority, failed to get an acceptance 9 months ago of our military decision to destroy the enemy's aircraft in their lairs. The Secretary of State will long be dead and buried before history renders its decision that, because of his unwillingness to press for the acceptance of an imperative military requirement, many an American and many an allied serviceman has died unnecessarily. I will not apologize for or forgive the blood of others which is on his hands by joining those who pretend that what was accomplished in San Francisco is adequate reason for overlooking and forgiving and forgetting the monumental failures and errors in judgment in Korea.

Nine long and dismal months have passed in Korea since the military were denied the right to properly and adequately protect themselves against attacking enemy aircraft. What has taken place in this period? A year ago our aircraft had complete control of the air in Korea. Our bombers then could roam at will through the skies. That freedom of action is no longer possible. Our bombers must be protected wherever they go today over North Korea. We have lost some of our largest bombers and are certain to lose more.

I do not mind so much the loss of the physical things that go into the making of a bomber, a B-36, for example, but I think of its crew, the pilots and navigators, the bombardiers, being crushed by the impact with the land, because of our utter unwillingness to do what was necessary in an attempt to give those kids a fair sort of chance to come home again.

In the past year, the enemy has built more and larger air bases in Manchuria from which to send over an ever-increasing number of attacking aircraft. We read only of the enemy aircraft we shoot down. We are seldom advised of our own losses. The jet air war which now prevails in Korea is accurately described as being the largest and greatest in history. Yet in the face of an ever-increasing build-up of enemy air strength, we have done literally nothing to destroy the enemy's ability to seriously injure us.

In May the Secretary of State said it would be unwise for us to pursue enemy aircraft to their lairs if by so doing we brought enemy air strength in against our operation. How completely unintelligible can a political war manager become? Do any of my colleagues believe that if we attacked enemy air bases in Korea the situation would be much more dangerous than is the case today?

I think the situation has been and is about like this. In January the enemy had a very limited air strength and air potential in Manchuria. By attacking his bases then, we could have destroyed

what he had and prevented him from substantially increasing his strength. By reason of what we failed to do, the enemy has had nine full months in which to prepare to launch several thousand aircraft against the allied forces. With the passage of each day during which we fail to take the air war to the enemy in Manchuria, we are enabling the enemy to better prepare himself to defend his installations and to destroy ours.

The case in favor of attacking enemy air bases in Manchuria can be supported in many ways.

War is largely a measure of one capability against another. In the construction of aircraft, all capabilities are not attained simultaneously. The constant struggle of designers is to balance range against speed and maneuverability. The best information I have is that the Reds are using jet aircraft which exceed American jets in both speed and maneuverability. It is said that at 40,000 feet enemy aircraft can run circles around our aircraft.

We must assume it to be a fact that we have thus far been very successful in combating enemy aircraft. A pretty sound reason for this is that we have our first team fighting the aerial war in Korea. Probably a majority of our pilots are combat veterans who gained their experience and skill through many combat missions in the last war.

In the beginning of the Korean air war it was obvious that many of the enemy's pilots were poorly trained and were sent into battle to gain experience. No such opportunity was ever previously available to any military force. If the Red invader lived through a pass or two at our aircraft, he was able to break off the engagement at his choice and fly away to complete safety across the Yalu River. The enemy pilot of today, however, is generally acknowledged to be reasonably able and getting better every day.

What seems clear to me is that the air-power battle in Korea is not likely to be won by aerial combat by our forces. As the battle grows in size and intensity, as I notice with complete interest it is growing every day, I should think that the air war itself can only be won by destroying enemy aircraft on the ground. Should the Allied forces destroy enemy air bases in the Manchurian sanctuary, there is reason to believe that the enemy would not be able to fly jet aircraft missions into Korea and out again because of the range limitation of the jet aircraft now employed against us. We might effectively and completely force the aerial battle in Korea to cease by destroying the jet bases in Manchuria. Speed would be of no avail to the enemy if he did not have enough range to reach his target and return. If the enemy's sanctuary is put out of business he would be required to employ bases elsewhere and these of necessity would be much further away from his present target.

Need we be reminded that it has now been more than 3 months since Jacob Malik first put out a peace feeler. In the many weeks which have gone by, we have been trying to negotiate with the Communist forces at Kaesong and have gotten nowhere. For 44 days, between

July 10 and August 23, the Reds used the talks as a screen behind which they moved fresh troops, more aircraft, a large quantity of artillery, and many modern tanks into the line and in reserve. That is where they are now, waiting to go against us. This build-up has been continuing during the weeks which have followed the breaking off of the cease-fire talks in late August. General Bradley is aware of all of these factors. He knows that unless an honorable cease fire is agreed to without delay—and I take this to mean within the next few days—the Allied forces must do one of two things. We must either take the initiative and go forward or the enemy appears to have sufficient forces to drive us backward. I do not know whether the enemy has such a force or not, but I know that he is going to try to drive us backward with the forces at his disposal if we attempt much longer to stand still. The least anyone can say is that his power is considerable. The one thing which my Nation must now appreciate fully is that the Allied forces, whatever their managers' wishes might be, will not find it possible, if the cease-fire talks fail, to remain much longer where they are. If Operation Killer ever was justified, it is rapidly becoming outmoded and impossible to maintain. The spilling of blood on a stationary line is an unsatisfactory and unacceptable solution for the challenge which the free nations undertook to meet in June of 1950.

As I speak, gallant young Americans are dying and being torn to shreds in Korea. My heart and conscience are directed to providing a purpose which will justify the sacrifices which so many have made so uncomplainingly. Before this day is over other Americans will die in Korea. Many more will die before the fighting is finished either by a cease-fire agreement or the successful conclusion of "Operation Victory." When one's nation is in trouble and war results, it follows that men, and women, too, must die. If they do so in pursuit of a military conclusion—to use the words spoken by General Bradley yesterday—which leads to the restoration of peace, their sacrifices are understandable and are justified before God and man. What is totally inexcusable is for men to remain involved in a war which is not headed for victory.

Gen. Omar Bradley said yesterday to those in the field who do the fighting, while we do the talking, that the time is soon to be here when the fighting must be called off now or we must and shall go forward until the enemy has been driven from Korea. Could any leader say anything less to the last best hope we have—the youth of our land?

EMERGENCY PROFESSIONAL HEALTH TRAINING ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946, to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in urging the prompt passage by the Senate of S. 337, a bill which, while it may not be of such nature as to provoke great emotionalism or to warrant banner headlines, nonetheless, in my considered opinion, is of great importance. It is important to the success of our Armed Forces. It is vitally necessary if we are to create an effective civilian defense mechanism throughout the country, and it is essential to the physical well-being of the civilian population upon whose continued productivity we must rely to more than counterbalance the apparently inexhaustible supply of manpower now under the control of the Kremlin.

I realize that those are strong words with which to characterize a legislative measure in the field of health. But, Mr. President, I believe the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has already made it clear that they are justified. I am confident, too, that when the Senate listens to the arguments of his colleagues on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, who—Republicans as well as Democrats—are as one in urging the immediate passage of this bill, the Senate, too, will agree that it would be difficult to overemphasize the importance of S. 337 to the future strength and welfare of this Nation.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to recapitulate the telling reasons for supporting the bill which have been so ably put forth by the Senator from Rhode Island in his fine presentation earlier today. Permit me instead briefly to call attention to those phases of the testimony given us which, in the light of my past experiences in the Congress, were most persuasive with me.

It has been my privilege in years past to serve as chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs and, on coming to the Senate, first on the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and later on the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Throughout World War II, I was unable to escape a constant awareness of the severe strain which military necessity was placing on the capacity of our medical profession to meet civilian needs. As I know very well and as I believe every Member of the Senate knows, the physicians, dentists, and nurses of this country during those trying years, by an expenditure of almost superhuman effort and through sacrifices well out of proportion to those most of us not in military service were called upon to bear, managed to meet the Nation's needs. But as we also know, seldom during those years were we ever seriously concerned with the prospect of unheralded, airborne atomic and bacteriological invasion. Had we then been forced to deploy our medical manpower to meet the sort of threat which now hovers over our centers of production, the result might well have been catastrophic. Can anyone among us here today take the responsibility for saying that we shall be as fortunate tomorrow or next month or next year? I think not. In the 2 years since the Senate, after the war and in a time

of apparent peace, passed a bill which to all intents and purposes was identical with the one now before us, aggression which began with a swift surprise attack, has taken place in Korea.

If this measure deserved and won the support of the Senate of the United States in 1949, as it did, then, Mr. President, since the events of June 1950 it is many times more deserving of our wholehearted support today.

I need not discuss in any detail what the events in Korea and all that they imply mean in terms of our national economy and the life of our people. But they do mean that now and for an indefinite time in the future, this Nation is committed to the maintenance of an armed force totaling at least 3,500,000 men. And they do mean that for that same indefinite period, we are committed to such a mobilization of our economy as will guarantee those Armed Forces the weapons, the supplies, and the medical and other services which will enable them to halt in their tracks the forces of evil now enlisted under the banner of Communist aggression.

To these two things, Mr. President, the Congress and the people of the United States are committed: Armed Forces at peak strength and composed of men and women in the best possible physical condition; and a civilian population so organized and served as to be able to supply our Armed Forces under whatever conditions of stress or strain or catastrophe may occur. Both pillars of our defense, Mr. President, rest in fact on one thing—the health and strength of our people. And they in turn rest upon the adequacy and capability of the health services of the Nation available to both the Armed Forces and our civilian population. If those services were inadequately manned in 1949, if the schools upon which we must rely to train health services personnel were inadequately staffed, housed, and supported in 1949—and they were, Mr. President—then certainly the situation is immeasurably more critical today. To meet the needs of a three-and-one-half-million-man force, the Department of Defense—which, incidentally, urges us to pass this bill—is having to take from civilian life some 11,000 more physicians than it needed a year ago. A year ago, there was not a community in America which felt that it had a surplus of doctors, yet 11,000 have been or are being withdrawn from those communities. When we realize that the average non-specialist physician must serve at least a thousand laymen, that means that some 11,000,000 of our people are losing their doctors, and will have to seek such care as they need from already overburdened men of medicine. Despite this, Mr. President, a subcommittee of this body presided over by the able and distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who now presides with such distinction over the Senate, has repeatedly told us that our Armed Forces do not yet have proper health services. I have not had the opportunity, Mr. President, to study with care all the excellent reports made to us by the Preparedness

Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. But I have read three of the reports issued by that subcommittee which has done such a splendid job under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. Apparently, since it is not otherwise indicated, those reports reflect the unanimous conclusions of Senators KEFAUVER, BRIDGES, HUNT, SALTONSTALL, STENNIS, and MORSE, who are serving so well on that subcommittee. Mr. President, permit me to read just a few brief excerpts from the reports which these able colleagues of ours have made on the conditions they found to exist on our military bases.

At Camp Roberts, Calif., they found:

There was a shortage of doctors and nurses.

At Fort Riley, Kans., they found that—

In order to give adequate care of the patients, medical personnel are required to work unusually long hours.

The post surgeon at Fort Riley felt that 30 doctors were needed but only 20 had been assigned. And, again quoting from the report of this distinguished subcommittee:

Additional doctors had been requested but were not available.

And this, Mr. President, is what our colleagues had to say in their report on the Sheppard Air Force Base in Texas:

The number of doctors and nurses assigned to the hospital was considered inadequate in view of the military population at the base, and although additional doctors and nurses were authorized, they were not available.

Further on in that same report, the subcommittee told us:

The great amount of dental care needed by recruits places an excessive burden on the dentists assigned and as a result approximately 35 percent of the recruits leave the base still in need of dental work.

In view of such findings, Mr. President, it certainly is no surprise that since Korea, the American Legion and the Disabled American Veterans, who know how important proper medical care is to the efficient functioning of a fighting force, have joined with the American Dental Association, with the deans of our medical schools, and with a host of other organizations in urging us promptly to pass this bill. They know, as we must know, that it takes years to train doctors and nurses and ancillary health service personnel. They know that when Congress failed to pass this bill 2 years ago, we gave notice to Stalin that he could count on two more years of a medically unprepared America. We cannot recapture these lost years. But we can and we must see to it that this bill passes now: That, before another academic year goes by, our schools can undertake the first steps toward providing the 22,000 additional doctors and the tens of thousands of additional nurses which the National Security Resources Board found we will need by 1954.

I am sure I need not take up the time of the Senate to relate in any greater

detail the relationship between this bill and the needs of our Armed Forces. But permit me a few brief comments on another related and not unimportant subject. As a result of the last war, we now have more than 18,000,000 veterans to whom this Nation and the Congress owe many obligations, some of them in the field of medical care. Although the Congress beyond any shadow of a doubt has sincerely meant to discharge those obligations in all good faith, we have not done so. We have tried. We have conscientiously considered, planned and legislated. We have appropriated the hundreds of millions of dollars needed to build the hospitals and to pay for the medical care to which we and the people of this Nation believe our veterans are entitled. We have actually built the hospitals. But we are not providing the care.

Why not? For the very reason that we must pass this bill. Because this country does not have enough doctors and nurses to meet the needs of its people; because perfectly planned and fully equipped buildings called veterans' hospitals do not in themselves mean medical care for veterans; and because dollars appropriated to pay for the services of doctors and nurses do not mean medical care for veterans. Hospital buildings are mockeries, hospital equipment is useless, and dollars for doctors might just as well be doughnuts if we cannot find the doctors or the nurses to staff the buildings, use the equipment, and provide the care. And that is the position in which we now find ourselves. As of today, in veterans' hospitals throughout the country, there are enough wards closed because of lack of medical personnel to provide the equivalent of 11 hospitals of 200 beds capacity apiece. Think of it, Mr. President, we have used the taxpayers' money; we have built these hospitals because they were needed; we have equipped them completely. But today, although thousands of veterans need the care which could be given in these institutions, they stand empty, mute witnesses to our failure to support and strengthen the schools which could train the men and women needed to make them meaningful; they stand empty and in so doing show how erroneous is any statement that we have no shortage of medical personnel.

It is to high light this situation, Mr. President, that I have introduced and will shortly call up an amendment to the pending bill. It is an amendment which merely adds on line 4, page 30, after the word "Forces," the words "and the Veterans' Administration." We must realize that it would be better for us to have highly trained personnel—skilled in the art of healing—with no hospitals at all than to have the hospitals without the medical men and women needed to staff them. We must realize that our veterans are not getting the care which we said they needed when we built these hospitals. We must realize that, in the considered and unanimous opinion of your full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the only feasible way to assure the supply of person-

nel needed to give that care, is through the passage of this bill.

Mr. President, I have spoken of S. 337 as it relates to our Armed Forces and our veterans. I know I need say no more about its bearing on civilian defense than to point out that today every comprehensive program of civilian defense rests on one assumption—that there will be available, wherever needed, in the event of enemy attack, teams of highly trained doctors and medical technicians.

In World War II, our civilian defense leaders had to be experts in administration. Now, we are told, our top civilian defense men should be doctors, and highly trained doctors, who can instantly recognize the nature of the attack, analyze the chances of saving lives, and by the orders they give to the civilian defense corps contain within a limited area the havoc wrought by radioactivity and contagious disease. Never before have we had to prepare ourselves against the type of attack that could within minutes make a flaming holocaust of any American town or city or which, through the utilization of deadly bacteria, lead to the wholesale destruction of men, women, and children. We do now. But we cannot so prepare. And we cannot because we just do not have the trained people needed to plan and to administer the necessary defense programs. For this job alone, the National Security Resources Board found that we need a minimum of 3,300 more doctors by 1954. We do not have them now, Mr. President, and we will not have them then. But, Mr. President, we can have them a year or two later if we promptly pass this bill. God grant that they will not be needed for such work, but God grant that should the need arise, we will have had the wisdom and the foresight to have seen that the need was met.

Let me now turn, Mr. President, away from talk of war and death and destruction. I believe it was necessary talk, Mr. President; considered and sincere talk. I believe that anyone who considers the content and objectives of the pending bill in the light of world conditions today will agree that the picture I have drawn was not overdrawn. But I should like to turn now, at least for a moment, to the kind of thought in which the Congress engaged after the last war when we talked of peace instead of war, when we planned in terms of construction rather than of destruction, when we thought in terms of healing rather than of maiming or of being maimed. At that time, in 1946, Mr. President, the Congress passed the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, the so-called Hill-Burton Act. Under its provisions, with the States and local communities in charge and with the aid of Federal funds and the skilled and devoted assistance of United States Public Health Service personnel, we surveyed and plotted the Nation's need for civilian hospitals. With the surveys completed and priorities assigned in terms of need, the Congress year after year appropriated funds for construction. I see on the floor the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. He sits as a member of a

subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which handles appropriations for hospital construction. He knows how we have struggled to secure the construction of hospitals and how Congress has responded and provided the money with which to build them.

That the program is really needed, soundly planned, wisely administered, and a source of continuous gratification to the people and their Congress is, I believe, proved by our recent action in approving the appropriation of \$82,500,000 for further construction under the act. The hospitals which will be built with those funds are really needed, badly needed, and they will be used. But, I think we are bound to agree that just as in the case of the veterans' hospitals, I discussed earlier, although every single one of these hospital beds is required and though each of the hospitals will be utilized, they must have doctors and nurses. We must continue to build these hospitals as they are absolutely necessary. But we know that right now, in a number of cities, even here in Washington, whole wards in existing hospitals stand vacant because they cannot be staffed. Can we who talk and try to practice sound economy and consistency and common sense continue to permit such a condition to obtain? Or will we as a body do what that committee which you charged with the responsibility of studying these problems in minute detail unanimously recommends? Let us do the whole job. We have undertaken to build the hospitals. Now let us make sure that staffs will be available to man them. It can be done through the enactment of the bill which is now before us.

And while we are thinking in terms of the Hospital Construction Act, Mr. President, permit me to point out a few analogies between that measure which has worked so very well and the bill to provide similarly limited Federal aid to education in the health professions. The committee was determined that in this instance any program of Federal aid must be carried out in accordance with our best traditions in this field of education. Therefore, just as in the case of the Hill-Burton Act, we determined to build on what already existed and to make the fullest use of the knowledge, the experience, and the spirit which have led to such great advances in medical, dental, and nursing education. It was for this reason that we included private, nonprofit, or voluntary schools as they are usually known along with State-supported institutions; for example, the hospital schools of nursing which exist in every State as well as the university schools of nursing which exist in but a few.

And, as has been pointed out, we have endeavored to limit the power of the Federal Government over the program to the minimum degree necessary to a reasonable check upon the expenditures of Federal appropriations. In order to protect the Surgeon General from pressure groups in administering the program and to give him and ourselves the benefit of their experience and wisdom we have, as in the case of the Hospital Construction Act, provided the Surgeon

General with a carefully balanced council, which is to report directly to the Congress within 2 years, on how the act is working and on how we might perfect it. Of course, the council will consider all problems. It will consider the question whether there is any need to tighten further the provision limiting Federal authority. I believe the committee has tightened that provision as much as it can be done, and still have assurance that the money will be expended as the bill provides.

Again, as in the case of the Hill-Burton Act, Mr. President, this bill has been carefully designed to preserve and to stimulate maximum effort at self-support on the part of recipient institutions. We have provided in the first place that the proposed grants must be to supplement and not to replace existing sources of income; we have further provided that in no case can the total instructional grants exceed 50 percent of the costs of instruction and then, within that framework we have set up a carefully calculated schedule of grants which in effect will mean that only the poorer schools will come anywhere close to receiving 50 percent of their costs while those better off will receive approximately 20 to 25 percent of their costs. In short, Mr. President, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in drafting this bill has drawn heavily upon its wealth of experience in related fields and we are unanimous in our belief that we here offer you a soundly conceived measure.

Mr. President, before closing these remarks, permit me to say that my part of the country is justifiably proud of the way our medical, dental, and nursing schools, both public and private, nonprofit, have grown and improved their facilities in recent years. Even a brief glance at the statistics will show that our schools are training more doctors, in proportion to population, than are schools in any other part of the Nation. This is as it should be, for our need for physicians, especially in the rural areas, is very great.

Despite these great advances by southern universities, however, I want to read to you just a few sentences from the telegrams which have reached me from medical school deans, since word reached them that S. 337 was to be debated on the floor of the Senate.

From my own alma mater, the University of Alabama, President John M. Gallalee, and the acting dean, Tinsley R. Harrison of the medical college, warn that the present level of medical education is in grave jeopardy here because of insufficient funds to meet expanding costs. Our medical school, like all others, is in desperate need of additional funds for maintenance of present program and projected plan for training increased medical personnel.

From Emory University, a great institution in our neighboring State of Georgia, I have a message from Dr. R. Hugh Wood, dean of its medical school, saying very frankly that he regrets the necessity of Federal support to medical education, but going on to assert that Emory University School of Medicine supports S. 337 because it seems clear that Federal support will be necessary.

Dr. D. S. Pankratz, of the School of Medicine at the University of Mississippi, writes that "we are in the process of converting a 2-year school into a 4-year medical school with more students." He put his school's situation very bluntly: "We need aid now." Certainly a school such as this will be a valuable addition to our roster of medical institutions, and it will be tragic if it comes so close to success only to fail for lack of funds. The State of Mississippi needs the doctors who can be trained at her university.

I have seen messages from virtually every school, public or private, in the South urging passage of S. 337. President Gordon Gray, of the University of North Carolina, urges passage of the bill. Dean Youmans, of Vanderbilt University School of Medicine in Nashville; Dean Kinsman, at Louisville School of Medicine; President Kenneth M. Lynch, of the Medical College of South Carolina; and Acting Dean R. L. Pullen, at Tulane University Medical School, in New Orleans—all have made it clear that their schools will be in difficult straits unless the Congress passes the Emergency Professional Health Training Act.

These are the views of the men entrusted with the responsibility of running our southern medical schools. I need not tell you, Mr. President, that not only are they men of integrity who choose their words well and carefully but they are also men who would be the first to denounce any program which could conceivably lead to Federal intervention in the institutions which they head. They support this bill.

But, Mr. President, I fear that in speaking so much of medical schools we may overlook the needs of our schools of nursing; needs which differ somewhat in character but not at all in intensity or in their importance to the Nation's health.

At this moment there is not a single locality in the Nation which is not woefully short of nurses. Our civilian hospitals need them; our veterans' hospitals need many, many more; even our Armed Forces cannot come near to filling their quotas. Representative Bolton, of Ohio, who is perhaps better informed on nursing needs than any of us, estimates conservatively that we face a shortage of at least 49,000 nurses by 1954. Normal population growth alone will create a demand for 10,000 additional nurses in the next 3 years. And it takes 3 years to educate a professional nurse.

The Health Resources Advisory Committee of the Office of Defense Mobilization has stated in no uncertain terms:

First. The present nurse shortage is critical.

Second. Immediate Federal aid to nursing education is essential.

Third. A broad recruitment program is essential.

Mr. President, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, unanimously came to these same conclusions as a result of its own independent survey. And, with the aid of our hospital associations, our nursing educators, and our associations of nurses engaged in the practice of their profession, we have written into this bill provisions calculated to solve these problems. Let us remember, that

we are dealing with an interrelated problem involving schools of medicine, of dentistry, of nursing, and of public health. To think or to act in terms of any of those problems alone would be to lose perspective and further the imbalance which now exists. The bill before us deals with those problems on the basis of their interrelationship and proposes their common solution. In this connection, let me say that the members of your committee are unanimous in recommending this solution as the best available and have taken pains to provide in the bill for a mechanism through which the Congress is assured that any flaws in the program will be reported to the Congress promptly for correction.

In closing, Mr. President, permit me to make one thing crystal clear. That is that in my opinion and, I believe, in the opinion of every member of the committee, the proposal we now urge the Senate to adopt does not in any sense represent an invasion by the Federal Government of local fields of responsibility, and that it does not represent an assumption on the part of the Federal Government of local or State responsibilities. On the contrary, it represents but a partial assumption by the Federal Government of a responsibility which should have been recognized as ours long ago; a recognition by us of a national obligation growing out of national needs. We have too long and I believe unfairly allowed to devolve on certain of the States and on a few private institutions—a burden much of which should have been our own and which has now grown far too heavy for them to carry alone.

I say this, Mr. President, because the nature of the schools with which we are here concerned is such that not one of them now exists or ever has existed to serve its own immediate community or to meet only the needs of those who have shouldered its financial burden. These schools turn out dentists, physicians, surgeons, nurses, and their highly skilled coworkers who serve to restore health and to save life, not just in the areas where the schools are located but to save lives and to serve humanity throughout the entire country. This is as it should be. This is what we must sustain. The alternative—and, Mr. President, it is shaping up far too rapidly and far too menacingly—is that those who have carried the full financial burden thus far and who are now being asked to take on greatly expanded programs as a direct result of a national need—find themselves unable to do so; unable to see why they should carry the load alone even if they could; and quite rightly growing restive under the refusal of the rest of us to do our part. Our failure to give help will convert these institutions into provincial schools hedged about with even further restrictions on admission, binding their graduates in advance to certain types of service in certain localities regardless of individual capabilities or of the broader public interest. The process, Mr. President, is already under way. Allowed to continue it can only mean a widespread deterioration in the quality of our

medical men. It will force attempts at unwise, unnecessary, and extremely wasteful duplication of institutions and facilities, all of them of far less stature or value than those which would continue and those which would come into being under the terms of S. 337. The total cost in direct outlay by individual taxpayers for such a sorry substitute for the well-planned, soundly based expansion of education in the health professions which we propose, would be immeasurably greater than that entailed by the present bill.

Mr. President, these schools exist to serve the needs of the Nation. As a matter of cold fact, the Federal Government—to meet only in part the needs of our Army, Navy, Air Force, Public Health Service, and Veterans' Administration—is by far the largest user of their output. It is time, Mr. President, that the Nation, through the Federal Government assumed its share of the burden they have been carrying for all of us. Not only is it time we did, but the time has come when we must, Mr. President, because these schools cannot and are not doing the job today. No longer can they carry this burden. The only way the job can be done is by having the Federal Government assume its part of the responsibility, through the enactment of this bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, with all the earnestness I can command I urge my colleagues to pass this bill promptly, in the vital interest of the people they represent and in the interest of the entire Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks, a list of organizations which have endorsed S. 337.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS WHICH HAVE ENDORSED SENATE BILL 337

VETERAN GROUPS

The American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, Regular Veterans' Association, Jewish War Veterans.

PROFESSIONAL GROUPS

American Dental Association, American Association of Dental Schools, American Council on Education, American Public Health Association, Association of American Medical Colleges, Association of American Universities, Association of Land Grant Colleges, Association of Schools of Public Health, National Dental Association, National Health Council.

CITIZEN GROUPS

National Grange; Cooperative Health Federation of America; National Council of Jewish Women; American Federation of Labor; Congress of Industrial Organizations; Indiana State Industrial Union Council; International Association of Machinists; United Auto Workers, A. F. of L.; United Auto Workers, CIO; National Farmers Union; Montana Farmers Union; Cooperative League of the United States of America.

PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

Alabama: Tinsley R. Harrison, acting dean, Medical College of Alabama, Birmingham; John M. Callalee, president, University of Alabama, Birmingham.

California: Francis Smyth, dean, University of California School of Medicine, San Francisco; Ernest G. Sloman, dean, College of Physicians and Surgeons, School of Dentistry, San Francisco.

Colorado: Robert L. Lewis, dean, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Denver.

District of Columbia: Hunter Guthrie, S. J., president, Georgetown University; Joseph L. Johnson, dean Howard University College of Medicine; Russell A. Dixon, dean, Howard University College of Dentistry.

Georgia: Dr. R. Hugh Wood, dean, School of Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta; John E. Buhler, dean, Emory University School of Dentistry, Atlanta.

Illinois: L. T. Coggeshall, dean, University of Chicago School of Medicine, Chicago; John J. Sheinin, Ph. D., M. D., dean, The Chicago Medical School, Chicago; Dr. John F. Shehan, dean, Loyola University, Stritch School of Medicine, Chicago; Dr. A. R. Baralt, Jr., dean, School of Dentistry, Loyola University, Chicago; Gladys Kinyery, R. N., dean, School of Nursing, Loyola University, Chicago.

Indiana: Maynard K. Hine, dean, Indiana University School of Dentistry, Indianapolis.

Kentucky: J. Murry Kinsman, dean, Louisville School of Medicine, Louisville.

Louisiana: William W. Frye, M. D., dean, Louisiana State University School of Medicine, New Orleans; R. L. Pullen, acting dean, Tulane University, New Orleans; Frank J. Houghton, D. D. S., dean, Loyola Dental School, New Orleans.

Maryland: Alan M. Chesney, M. D., dean, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore.

Michigan: Henry F. Vaughn, dean, University of Michigan School of Public Health, Ann Arbor; Dr. Rene Rochon, dean, Dental School, University of Detroit, Detroit; C. J. Steiner, S. J., president, University of Detroit, Detroit.

Minnesota: Dr. Harold S. Diehl, dean of medical sciences, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Mississippi: D. S. Pankratz, dean, University of Mississippi School of Medicine, Oxford.

Missouri: Robert A. Moore, dean, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis; Melvin A. Casberg, M. D., dean, St. Louis University School of Medicine, St. Louis; L. R. Main, dean, School of Dentistry, St. Louis University, St. Louis.

Nebraska: P. J. Carroll, M. D., dean, Creighton University School of Medicine, Omaha; James H. Pence, D. D. S., dean, Creighton University School of Dentistry, Omaha; Dean Bert L. Hooper, College of Dentistry, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

New England: William S. Carlson, president, University of Vermont, Burlington; James Stevens Simmons, M. D., brigadier general United States Army (retired), Harvard School of Public Health, Boston; Dr. Dwight O'Hara, dean, Tufts College Medical School, Boston; C. M. H. Long, dean, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, Conn.; James M. Faulkner, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston; Ira V. Hiscock, chairman, Yale University School of Public Health, New Haven; C. D. Marshall-Day, dean, Tufts College Dental School, Boston; James Bryant Conant, president, Harvard University School of Dental Medicine, Boston; George Packer Berry, dean, Harvard Medical School, Boston; Leonard Carmichel, president, Tufts College, Medford, Mass.; James M. Dunning, dean, Harvard School of Dental Medicine, Boston.

New York: Stockton Kimball, M. D., dean, University of Buffalo School of Medicine, Buffalo; Carlyle F. Jacobsen, executive dean of medical education, State University of New York (medical schools at Syracuse and New York City), Albany; G. H. Whipple, dean, University of Rochester, Rochester;

Dr. R. S. Cunningham, dean, Albany Medical College, Albany; Willard C. Rappleye, M. D., vice president in charge of medical affairs, Columbia University, New York; Currier McEwen, M. D., dean, New York University College of Medicine, New York; Leon J. Gauchat, dean, University of Buffalo School of Dentistry, Buffalo.

North Carolina: Gordon Gray, president, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; John C. Brauer, dean, school of dentistry, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

North Dakota: W. F. Potter, M. D., dean, school of medicine, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks.

Ohio: Charles A. Doan, M. D., dean, Ohio State University, College of Medicine, Columbus; Stanley Dorst, dean, faculty of medicine, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati.

Pennsylvania: J. M. Mitchell, dean, University of Pennsylvania, School of Medicine, Philadelphia; J. L. T. Appleton, dean, University of Pennsylvania School of Dentistry, Philadelphia; Marion Fay, dean, Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

South Carolina: Kenneth M. Lynch, president, Medical College of South Carolina, Charleston.

Tennessee: John B. Youmans, M. D., dean, Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Nashville; O. W. Hyman, vice president, University of Tennessee, Memphis; W. H. Allen, dean and director of dental education, Meharry Medical College, Nashville.

Utah: John Z. Bowers, dean, college of medicine, University of Utah, Salt Lake City.

Wisconsin: John S. Hirschboeck, M. D., dean, Marquette University School of Medicine, Milwaukee; O. M. Dresen, D. D. S., dean, Marquette University School of Dentistry, Milwaukee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement listing the members of the Health Resources Advisory Committee, Office of Defense Mobilization.

There being no objection the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMBERS OF THE HEALTH RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE, OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, chairman; chairman, department of physical medicine and rehabilitation, New York University, Bellevue Medical Center, New York City, also associate editor of New York Times.

Dr. Alan Gregg, vice president, Rockefeller Foundation, New York City.

Dr. James C. Sargent, professor of urology, Marquette University School of Medicine, Milwaukee, Wis., also chairman of council on national emergency medical care of the American Medical Association.

Dr. Harold S. Diehl, dean of medical sciences, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Dr. Leo J. Schoenly, D. D. S., private practice, New Orleans, La., also past chairman of council on dental health, American Dental Association.

Mrs. Ruth Kuehn, dean, School of Nursing, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., also member National Committee for Improvement of Nursing Services.

Dr. William P. Sheppard, professor of public health, Stanford University, San Francisco, Calif., also vice president, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.

Dr. John B. Pastore (deceased), executive director of the Hospital Council of Greater New York, also member of Council of Government Relations of the American Hospital Association.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I call up the amendments which were proposed by me on behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendments.

The legislative clerk read the amendments, as follows:

On page 32, line 6, strike out "\$500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200."

On page 32, line 8, strike out "\$500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,000."

On page 32, line 12, strike out "\$400" and insert in lieu thereof "\$160."

On page 32, line 14, strike out "\$400" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,600."

On page 32, line 18, strike out "\$150" and insert in lieu thereof "\$60."

On page 32, line 20, strike out "\$150" and insert in lieu thereof "\$600."

On page 32, line 25, strike out "\$200" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100."

On page 33, line 2, strike out "\$200" and insert in lieu thereof "\$300."

On page 33, line 6, strike out "\$400" and insert in lieu thereof "\$200."

On page 33, line 8, strike out "\$400" and insert in lieu thereof "\$600."

On page 33, line 11, strike out "\$150" and insert in lieu thereof "\$65."

On page 33, line 13, strike out "\$100" and insert in lieu thereof "\$185."

On page 33, line 20, strike out "\$100" and insert in lieu thereof "\$35."

On page 33, line 22, strike out "\$50" and insert in lieu thereof "\$115."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I understood the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island was going to speak on the amendments.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have considered the changes in S. 337 which would result from the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. The bill as reported by the committee placed about equal emphasis on two things, each of which we think important; one, was maintenance of existing schools; the second involved providing a stimulus to expansion. The Senators from Georgia and Oklahoma apparently agree that both things are important, but they feel it imperative that we place much more emphasis on expansion than on maintenance. Our committee is, of course, sympathetic to the objectives of the Russell-Kerr amendment. The committee felt, however, that only after the act is in operation for a year or two will we have sufficient experience to develop thoroughly adequate knowledge as to the exact distinctions which must be made as to the differences between schools and types of schools and between incentive and maintenance grants. Therefore, we gave relatively equal emphasis to both and provided for a council to analyze operations under the bill and to report back to the Congress as to any change in emphasis which might be needed. Of course, should we now change the

relative emphasis on expansion as against maintenance, the council will still function to advise us whether the ratios arrived at are proved by experience to be proper and effective or whether they are not. And, of course, we do know that we do need more doctors and nurses.

However, we also know that there is one basic difference between two categories of schools involved. On the one hand we have the medical and dental schools badly in need of financial aid but confronted with a surplus of potential students—many thousands of applicants more than they can accept. On the other hand we have the schools of nursing and of public health which, while equally in need of financial aid, have a shortage of applicants. It is for this reason that your committee so worded the scholarship provisions of this bill that unless the situation changes very radically, those funds will go to attract students to schools of nursing and of public health.

The differences between categories of schools and between the kind of problems which confront these schools were discussed in detail with the Senators from Georgia and Oklahoma, and as a result of those discussions a compromise amendment has been drafted which I believe is acceptable to both the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Oklahoma, and which has been adopted by formal action of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I might say at this juncture, in order to keep the record straight and clear, that there were seven members present, and there were seven who voted for it. I make that statement in order to draw a contrast with the statement I made earlier, that the original action was the unanimous action of the committee.

In effect, what this committee amendment does is to put much greater emphasis on the incentives offered medical, dental, and nursing schools to increase the size of their student bodies while, at the same time, recognizing the basic difference in the problems confronting them. The grants to schools of public health remain the same as in the bill that was reported to the Senate, inasmuch as their problems are of a completely different nature because of the unique composition of their student bodies and the unique form of the teaching methods they must follow.

The best estimates available to us—and we believe they are quite accurate—indicate that while the adoption of this committee amendment should result in an even greater interest in the output of trained health personnel, costs under the bill will be reduced by approximately \$72,000,000 over the life of the measure.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Georgia whether he will withdraw his amendment, in order that we may call up and act upon the amendment which has been proposed on the part of the committee; or I might address that question to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that while the Senator from

Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] had submitted an amendment for himself and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], it had been ordered to lie on the table and be printed. It has not been actually proposed to the bill, and, therefore, is not pending before the Senate.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, speaking for the Senator from Georgia and myself, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that we should be very glad to see the committee amendment adopted, and upon that having been done, would not call up our amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we are considering an amendment to Senate bill 337, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bennett	Hill	Monroney
Benton	Hoe	Moody
Brewster	Holland	Morse
Bricker	Humphrey	Mundt
Bridges	Hunt	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Nixon
Cain	Jenner	O'Connor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Connally	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Knowland	Smathers
Douglas	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Dworschak	Lodge	Sparkman
Eaton	Long	Stennis
Ellender	Magnuson	Taft
Ferguson	Malone	Thye
Frear	Maybank	Underwood
Fulbright	McCarran	Watkins
George	McCarthy	Welker
Gillette	McClellan	Wiley
Green	McFarland	Williams
Hayden	McKellar	Young
Hendrickson	McMahon	
Hickenlooper	Millikin	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I certainly must oppose the amendment. Whereas the original bill provided that the medical schools should receive \$500 for every current student, and \$1,000 for every additional student over and above the number they had previously trained, the pending amendment provides that the medical schools shall receive \$200 for each current student and \$2,200 for every additional student.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Am I correct in my understanding that the power of accepting a student lies within the jurisdiction of the medical college or the university? In other words, the bill is not so written, is it, that it would be within the power of the Government to direct a university or a medical college to accept a student?

Mr. TAFT. My impression is that there is a provision in the bill to the effect that medical colleges or universities can not make distinctions on the basis of residence. It is my understand-

ing that there is such a provision now in the bill. Of course, there are many State institutions which admit no students from outside the State. There are a number of others which admit a very few.

Mr. THYE. But there is no authority within the Government to direct a medical college or a university to accept a student unless the university or medical college is willing to accept him. If the pending bill became law the Federal Government could not dictate to a college or to a medical institution that it had to accept a student, could it?

Mr. TAFT. I do not believe they could be directed to take any particular students, but there is a provision to the effect that they cannot discriminate against students from outside the State. It seems to me that provision ought to be eliminated. In my opinion, it is a direct beginning of interference with the control by States over the education of their own students.

As to the particular amendment now pending, it seems to me very clear that it would certainly result in a lowering of the standards of all medical schools, because there would be a constant incentive simply to crowd the schools with students.

When the Senate was considering this subject 2 years ago, it was said the total cost of educating a student was \$1,750 a year. The Pastore amendment would give the schools \$2,200 per student. Probably the average cost today is fairly close to \$2,200. But certainly most schools charge tuition fees of \$500 or \$600. So with the figure used in the amendment the schools would make a profit on every new student, as I see it.

Not only that, but if the schools did not increase their facilities it would be almost impossible to increase the number of students without lowering the standard of education, because there seem to be available neither additional teachers nor additional buildings and facilities.

Mr. President, I think it would be a great mistake to adopt the amendment. I do not want the impression gained that I oppose the amendment with the understanding that if it is rejected I shall vote for the bill, because I intend to oppose the bill and make a speech on the bill itself. But regardless of that, I believe it would be a great mistake to adopt the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Has the Senator from Ohio estimated what the so-called Pastore amendment would cost?

Mr. TAFT. Its cost would be somewhat less than that of the committee bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I mean the over-all cost.

Mr. TAFT. I understand. Perhaps the Senator from Rhode Island has the figures of the relative over-all cost.

Mr. PASTORE. The amendment would reduce the cost by \$72,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Over the 5-year period?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; over the period of 5 years. Under the bill as it has been reported by the committee, the cost over the 5-year period would be \$367,000,000. Under the amendment the cost would be \$295,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. The figures the Senator from Rhode Island has given are much higher than the figures I have; but I am quite willing to accept his figures.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The fact of the matter is that the Kerr-Russell amendment goes even farther than the compromise amendment. We believe that the whole purpose behind our amendment is to expand the facilities of the medical schools. Of course, it can well be argued that not much of an adequate expansion can be made unless the current enrollment in the professional schools is maintained. In the first place, I think the Kerr-Russell amendment provided that the amount be reduced to \$100 per student. The pending amendment raises the amount of \$200, which, of course, maintains a high figure for expansion purposes.

The fact is that these are all accredited schools. I do not see the occasion for the alarm which the Senator from Ohio expresses. The purpose of the legislation is to expand the facilities of the schools, and I think the incentive ought to be attractive enough to realize that objective.

Mr. TAFT. Dean Berry, who is dean of the Harvard Medical School and chairman of the executive committee of the Association of American Medical Schools, says that he personally will not support the bill if it is so amended. He is speaking for the association. They would rather have no aid at all than to have the bill as amended by the Russell-Kerr amendment. That is also the view of the dean of the Yale Medical School and the dean of the Cornell Medical School. I should say that it is the view of the best medical educators in the country. Certainly if they do not want the assistance, this is no time to force it upon them.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Is it entirely possible that what they are trying to compel the Congress to do is to give them a subsidy for their present enrollment, rather than to have enacted legislation which would result in increased enrollment?

Mr. TAFT. They want also the increased enrollment. But the testimony before our committee, from schools like Johns Hopkins and others, was to the effect that they could not go on under present conditions, that they all had incurred such tremendous deficits in the operation of the schools that it was impossible for them to continue, or to find the money with which to continue medical schools.

Of course, if we are going to increase the number of students enrolled, we shall be obliged to have a very much larger

contribution for the building of additional facilities. There are two great limiting factors on the number of students who can be educated. The first is the number of teachers available to teach medical science. That in itself is an extremely difficult problem today. The other factor deals with the facilities, which must be quite elaborate, for hospitals, research, and laboratories. Without the expansion of those facilities we cannot hope for a very fast expansion in the number of students, unless the standard of medical education is to be reduced.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Does not the Senator from Ohio take the position that what we should do is to enact a law which would cover the deficit of the present operations of the medical schools, rather than to enact a law—at which the amendment referred to is aimed—which would provide an incentive for the increased enrollment of medical and dental students, and increase the number of doctors and dentists graduated by the medical schools of the country?

Mr. TAFT. The bill as originally proposed by the committee provided \$500 for each existing student and \$1,000 for each additional student. There is an incentive to enlarge facilities as fast as they can be expanded, keeping in mind sound medical education. I see no reason for changing that provision. It was originally adopted after long consideration. Mr. Oscar Ewing recommended \$300 for existing students and \$1,700 for other students.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. The committee deliberately turned down that proposal 2 years ago, and adopted the proposal contained in the bill, and adopted the same proposal this year, when the bill was introduced.

I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. As I understand, the Senator from Ohio has just told us that the medical schools of the country, on their present basis of income and expenses, are operating at a deficit.

Mr. TAFT. I think most of them are. I know that those with which I am familiar are operating at a deficit. They scrape up the money somehow, but some of them have encroached on their endowment funds to a very considerable extent.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator aware that, over and above the tuition, the cost in the average medical school to provide the education which is now being provided is \$1,850 per student?

Mr. TAFT. The figures which we had at the time we first started consideration of this proposal 3 or 4 years ago were to the effect that it cost about \$1,750 per student a year.

Mr. KERR. Over and above tuition.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; over and above tuition. The total cost was \$2,500 a year. That was the over-all cost. An over-all cost of \$2,500 a year means a cost to the Federal Government of \$10,000 to

educate a student. The highest tuition in the country—and it varies—is about \$700 or \$750. That would make a net cost of \$1,750.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, may I ask a question at this point?

Mr. TAFT. Colleges have had difficulty with their endowment funds. Of course, the State colleges which are being benefited receive money from the State treasury. So this proposal would relieve the State treasury of a burden.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question at that point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that if it costs from \$1,750 to \$1,850 a year for each student over and above the tuition which the student pays, if we enact a bill providing only \$1,000 a year for each additional student enrolled, we shall be seeking to induce the schools to increase their deficit, rather than seeking to enact legislation which would make it possible for them to increase their enrollment on a basis which would not increase their deficit, but on a basis which would make them whole and give them some leeway with respect to the increased enrollment?

Mr. TAFT. They will increase their enrollment, because they will have more money in general. But what the Senator is proposing to do is this: Although their deficit is only \$1,700 a year, he wants to give them \$2,200 for every additional student.

Mr. KERR. Not at all.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator wants to create a situation in which every school will make a profit from additional students and will have every incentive to admit them as fast as possible, regardless of the character of education the school is able to give them. That is my objection to the Senator's proposal.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KERR. If Senators have it in mind to provide an incentive for increased enrollment, is not that an effective answer to the Senator's objection?

Mr. TAFT. No. After all, this bill, at best, is only a stopgap. The bill admits that we do not know what ought to be done about medical education. I invite attention to the provisions on pages 49, 50, and 51. It will be seen that it is proposed to establish a National Council on Education for Health Professions. The duty of the National Council, as set forth on page 51, is as follows:

(5) Not later than 2 years' after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Council shall transmit to the Congress its recommendations concerning the extent and nature of support of education of professional and other health personnel (including practical nurses) which should be made available by the Federal Government in order to provide adequate health personnel to meet the health needs of the people. For such purpose, the Council shall conduct such surveys and studies as it deems appropriate, including studies of the financial condition of schools providing education in the health professions, and the relationship of their financial condition to their capacity to maintain and expand student enrollment, studies of the educational costs of such schools and of feasible means of calculating such costs on a uniform or comparable basis, and studies

of the extent to which equal opportunity to gain an education in the health professions is afforded all properly qualified students.

In other words, we set up a council or commission to study these problems, and before we know what it is going to decide, we pass a temporary bill to fill in the emergency. Originally the bill was for only 3 years. The National Council is given 2 years to make its survey. If we are really going to improve medical education and increase the number of doctors, a very much larger construction program will be required. Such a program will require the determination of the question as to whether we are going to encourage every State to have a new medical school, and how many new medical schools there ought to be, as well as the question of the extent to which the Federal Government is to subsidize the construction of such schools, or what percentage it will subsidize. Those are the things to be determined by the survey.

If we are to rush ahead and pay the medical schools a profit before the survey is completed, and before the facilities exist, and if the schools are to rush out and enroll twice as many students because they can make a profit out of them, certainly that is not the purpose of the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I invite the Senator's attention to page 35 of the bill. The Senator will admit that, in the first place, there cannot be an expansion beyond a 30-percent increase over the average of the past 3 years, so far as the first-year class is concerned. Beyond that, the expansion cannot be in excess of the average over the past 3 years, but no greater number than the number enrolled the previous year. So there cannot be an indiscriminate increase in the size of student bodies.

Mr. TAFT. There can be a 30-percent increase.

Mr. PASTORE. Only in the first year; but beyond that, the class cannot be larger than the class of the previous year.

Mr. TAFT. There can be a 30-percent increase in every class.

Mr. PASTORE. There can be a 30-percent increase only in the first-year class.

Mr. TAFT. The next first-year class can be increased by another 30 percent; and in the following year the first-year class can again be increased by 30 percent.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct; but the Senator said the enrollment would be doubled.

Mr. TAFT. I did not say that it would be doubled. Perhaps I used the term in a general sense. Certainly there is an incentive to make an increase up to the limit, without the necessary additional facilities, and without adequate teaching staffs.

The Senator says that these are all accredited schools. They are accredited schools, but we cannot catch up to their standards for at least 2 or 3 years from this time. I believe the proposal is unfortunate. I believe it is opposed by the Association of Medical Schools. The

fact that they wanted it enacted was the main reason I was in favor of it. If they are against it, I shall vote against it.

Mr. President, very briefly I should like to make a general statement as to why I am opposed to this bill. Although I joined in the introduction of the bill, it seems to me that the conditions have entirely changed since the bill was drawn 3 years ago. The bill would add approximately \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000 a year to the budget of the Government for the next 5 years.

So far as I am concerned, I believe we have reached a point in the mobilization program where we cannot afford to undertake any new program unless its emergency character can be shown beyond any question of doubt.

Last year we spent \$45,000,000,000. In fiscal 1952 it is estimated that we will spend \$68,000,000,000. Although we spent only \$45,000,000,000 in the last fiscal year, we are spending now, based on this quarter, at the rate of \$60,000,000,000 a year. The Bureau of the Budget estimates that in fiscal 1953 the Federal Government will spend \$85,000,000,000.

According to this morning's newspaper—

President Truman's National Security Council yesterday started work on a new strategic war plan calling for a big boost in air power and atomic weapons and only a relatively slight expansion of ground and sea power.

The newspaper article continues:

The plan was presented to the President by Defense Secretary Lovett. It has to be approved by the Council and the President before the defense budget for the fiscal year starting next July 1 can be fashioned. It reportedly calls for an outlay of approximately \$50,000,000,000 and provides for an Air Force of some 138 combat wings, an army of 27 divisions, a navy of 1,300 ships, and a Marine Corps of 3 divisions.

Omitting one paragraph, the article continues:

"No. 68" was the defense plan developed a year ago as the foundation for the current rearmament program.

The old plan called for a total military strength of nearly 3,500,000 men. The new plan provides for approximately 3,900,000 men.

In other words, the plan calls for an increase of 400,000 men in the Armed Forces during the next 3 or 4 years. 400,000 men would amount to an addition of \$4,000,000,000 to the current expense for the maintenance of the Armed Forces.

Probably another four billion or five billion dollars would be added for construction during the next 2 or 3 years. Therefore, I believe it is fair to say that the program we are facing will bring Federal expenditures to \$95,000,000,000. I believe that program is unwise.

The appropriation bill on which the \$85,000,000,000 estimate is based has already been passed by the Senate. With the addition I have mentioned it will be \$95,000,000,000. I believe that is too high. I believe it is beyond the economic capacity of the country. However, we have passed the bill. We have adopted the \$85,000,000,000 figure. Go-

ing to that point endangers the economic strength of the United States. However, if it is necessary to do so, I believe everything else must be curtailed. We must undertake to tighten our belts.

Conferees are meeting today on the new tax bill, which proposes to increase the tax of every individual in the United States. It would cut down the salaries of Senators by \$1,000, leaving them that much less to spend.

In all private fields we are asking for economy. I believe that in the field of domestic legislation we will have to take the same position no matter how meritorious a project may be from a domestic standpoint, unless there is a direct relation to the defense program.

The Budget Bureau estimates that in 1954 the defense program expenditures will drop from \$85,000,000,000 to \$75,000,000,000, and in 1955 to \$65,000,000,000. In other words, there is a hump there. I rather doubt that the figure will come down. As I see it, we will go along at the same level until probably 1954 or 1955. There is a hump where the economic security of the country, it seems to me, is in danger.

I do not believe that we can tax more than we are proposing to tax in the bill which is now in conference without doing great injury to the country. That bill will produce approximately \$67,000,000,000 of revenue when it goes into full operation. Perhaps we can go a little higher than that, but there is certainly a point at which the over-all taxes will do more harm than they will do good.

I believe that the taxes will be passed along in the prices charged, and therefore the standard of living will be reduced, economic instability will be brought about, and demands for increased wages will be made, which is time will have to be met. Thus we shall have a spiral of inflation, resulting from the tax itself, over and above a certain point.

The alternative is to borrow money. We are getting very rapidly toward the point of borrowing, in fiscal 1953 and fiscal 1954, from \$20,000,000,000 to \$25,000,000,000. If that is so, we face the problem of inflation in the United States regardless of controls of any kind.

So long as that condition exists, I do not believe we ought to start on any new domestic program, no matter how meritorious it may be.

It is claimed that the program outlined in the bill is an emergency program. Every domestic expenditure is claimed to be for an emergency program. I do not see that it is. We are providing for a study for 2 years, to determine what the medical education should be, and whether the Federal Government should take this step into a permanent subsidy of medical education.

The only emergency I can see is that more doctors are needed for the armed services. Any persons who start their education now will not be doctors for 6 years, so for the immediate emergency program this bill could be of no avail.

It seems to me that the proper thing to do is to pass a bill setting up a commission and to make a study, but to postpone the inauguration of the program until a report of the study has been made

and we have gotten over the hump of military expenditures.

There are other provisions in this bill which should be noted. There is a provision for scholarships for doctors, nurses, and dentists. There is not the slightest emergency requirement for scholarships for doctors. There are more applications for entrance to medical schools than the schools can handle. There is no need for a scholarship program for doctors. There is no need for a scholarship program for dentists at the present time.

Perhaps the nursing problem ought to be studied more completely, and there may be some necessity for a scholarship program for nurses. There is an entirely separate nurse bill now pending in the House of Representatives. There is also a provision to encourage the emergency education of nurses in a bill which we recently passed.

So far as construction is concerned, I cannot see any more emergency in that regard than in the case of any other construction. In fact, there is every good reason why at the present time, with the tremendous demand of the military for every kind of construction, we should not encourage the construction of other kinds.

Therefore, I do not feel that there is anything in this bill which justifies the contention that it provides for an emergency which is related to the immediate building up of our mobilization strength against Russia. I cannot see the basis, therefore, for claiming that it is an emergency bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from Ohio is a member of the important Committee on Finance. He has made a study of the tax bill. Do I understand that he feels, if we pass the pending bill and appropriate the money involved, that it would add to the public debt?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I myself feel very confident that we are not going to balance the budget in 1953 or 1954. If we obligate ourselves to spend the amount of money called for by this bill, the result will simply be to increase what we shall have to borrow from the American people, and therefore to cause the inflation which will be brought about by such a procedure.

The taxes will be substantial. I was just figuring that for an income of \$15,000, we are now required to pay \$4,448. Under the Senate bill, which is milder than the House bill, there will be an additional tax of \$500 on every individual; and even then we shall be \$25,000,000,000 short of balancing the budget, and I do not think we shall be able to increase taxes in 1953 sufficiently to meet any such military program as is in process, apart from any civilian program.

So it seems to me that we should strike out all of the bill except the part creating a committee to study the entire problem of medical education.

Unless that is done, I shall oppose the bill and shall vote against it.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Ohio was a

joint author of the bill in January of this year. I gathered from what he just said that at that time he was under the impression that the medical schools were in favor of the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator know of any large medical school in the South, aside from Duke Medical School, that is not State-supported?

Mr. KERR. I have just been told that there is one in Georgia and one in Louisiana and one in Tennessee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In the spring I received from doctors and from the two medical schools in Virginia letters endorsing the bill. The medical schools wanted the bill enacted.

I have never been very strongly in favor of any type of Federal aid for education, as the Senator from Oklahoma knows. However, I recognize that medical schools are in an acute situation with respect to the education of doctors. During the debate it has been pointed out that today fewer doctors are being graduated than were graduated 45 years ago.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Virginia is eminently correct in that statement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have been watching the applications of the State schools for increases in their budgets. Their new budgets run 50 percent, 60 percent, or 65 percent over their last budgets. I know they are not going to get the increased funds their budgets call for.

It would appear to me that in the case of the two State-supported medical schools in Virginia, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Georgia would enable them to have a smaller amount for their students than they have now, but to receive larger benefits if they enlarge their output. I believe that such an arrangement would be well calculated to reach our objective of educating more doctors. That would be the only excuse I would have for supporting Federal aid to education.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, as I began to say a moment ago, during his remarks the Senator from Ohio said that when he introduced the bill, he thought the medical schools were for it, and he was for it; but now he thinks that in its present form the medical schools are against the bill, and he is against it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to point out that on the first of January we had no reason whatever to expect the mobilization programs which call for the amount of expenditures now requested. In December, the Army had requested 2,700,000 men. Their estimates, so far as we could get them, were very vague and indefinite. The President had in his budget a figure of \$40,000,000,000 which was taken out of the air; and no one knew what the budget would be.

The military budget was not presented at all to the Congress until April or May. Certainly we had no reasonable ground to suspect that the total appropriations for the Government would exceed \$60,000,000,000 by so much that it could not reasonably be covered by taxation.

Now we have gone into a period of deficit financing.

Can the Senator tell me any way in which we can balance \$85,000,000,000 of expenditures in the fiscal year 1953? Can he state the taxes which can be levied to produce that amount of money?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have a number of things to say about that. I am discussing the amendment and the bill, not a figure which the Senator from Ohio thinks will be a deficit in a year which has not arrived.

I would say that if our country is confronted with an emergency in the fall of 1951, an emergency which the Senator from Ohio himself recognized in January 1951, I am not a defeatist to the extent that I am going to dodge the responsibility of that emergency on the basis of what someone says will be a deficit 18 months or 2 years from now.

Mr. President, I did not misquote the Senator from Ohio when I said that he stated that when he introduced the bill he understood the medical schools were for it, but now he understands they are against it, and therefore he is against it.

Mr. President, I wish to say that my support of the amendment which the committee in my opinion has wisely accepted to this bill is on the basis of the welfare of my country and the need of my country and on the basis of what I believe will be wholesome and beneficial today; and I support it because I think it is right, not because I think some group may be either for it or against it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to supplement the record the Senator from Oklahoma is now building by quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 12, 1951, from a colloquy which occurred between the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. If the Senator from Oklahoma will permit me to do so, I should like to read part of that colloquy at this time.

Mr. KERR. I am willing to yield for that purpose, if I may have unanimous consent to do so without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Oklahoma may yield for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio said at that time:

I quite agree that this bill is of such importance that it should not be passed during the call of the calendar.

That was at a time when the calendar was being called.

The Senator from Ohio also said:

It is entirely proper that objection should be made to consideration of the bill during the call of the calendar, but I think the bill

should be brought before the Senate at the earliest possible moment by the majority leader.

Of course, the problem in connection with the availability of doctors is entirely one of cost. The difficulty is that today, so it is estimated, the annual cost per student in a medical school averages approximately \$2,500, whereas the highest tuition is \$700 a year. The expense is so great that private schools have stopped increasing their facilities for the education of doctors; and unless someone undertakes to provide the facilities with which to educate more doctors, there will not be any increase over the number of doctors we have today, and thus the expansion of medical educational facilities will come to an end. That is why the bill is of such great importance.

So far as the last election is concerned—

The Senator from Ohio continued—

I may say that in nearly every speech I made in Ohio, I advocated the passage of this bill; consequently, I do not regard my own election, at least, as a repudiation of a bill which I supported in the last Congress.

Mr. President, all I say is that that statement was made by the Senator from Ohio on March 12. If we did not know there was an emergency in this country on March 12, 1951, we are going to have to wait an extremely long time to be convinced that an emergency is upon us, because that was in the darkest days of Korea; it was following the great retreat, the disaster in Korea. It was at a time when we had the great debate in the Senate on the question of sending American troops to Europe. The whole world was falling down around us then. To say that there was not at that time an emergency which should at least have made some impression in regard to the desirability of supporting or not supporting a bill of this sort, is beyond my ability to understand.

Of course, there was an emergency, and of course the Senator from Ohio was for the bill. I may say that there is no reason why he should not be for the bill now, because the condition existing today is no worse than the condition which existed in March of this year.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I will yield to the Senator from Ohio in a moment.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota; but I wish to remind him that I can understand the position of the Senator from Ohio. He said that when the medical schools were for the bill he was for it; and that now, when the medical schools are against the bill, he is against it. I do not agree with such a position, but I can understand it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me? That is not what I said.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am sure that my friend the Senator from Ohio will be in the Senate for a number of years, and I am sure that he is not interested in any other campaign for a number of years, and therefore I am sure that what would cause the Senator from Ohio to arrive at that conclusion is a general philosophy on his part rather than a consideration of any approaching election.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The difference between the situation on March 12 of this year and the situation at this time is only approximately \$20,000,000,000 in Federal expenditures; that is all. On March 12 we had no warning whatever that we were going to have a program under which we would have to spend \$85,000,000,000 in a single year. I know of no estimate at that time that the expenditures would exceed \$65,000,000,000.

The increased demands have developed in the last 3 months, and it is the reason why I oppose the bill.

If the Senator changes the bill so as to provide for the \$2,000 which he has mentioned, I would oppose the bill anyway, because from the very beginning we have fought over the problem of how much incentive was wise and how much incentive was not wise. If the medical schools feel that this incentive is not wise, I think their opinion is the best one.

Therefore, if they oppose the bill after the Senator's amendment is adopted, that is another reason why I shall vote against it. But I shall vote against it, even if the provisions for the \$500 and the \$1,000 payments are retained, because, under present financial conditions, I feel that it is perfectly clear that we cannot possibly carry out the provisions of the bill without borrowing money, in view of the program to which the administration has now committed us in the mobilization of the Armed Forces.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. Let me address myself for one moment to the remarks of the Senator from Ohio. I think his position on the amendment is of little significance because he would not favor its adoption, even if he approved it, unless the medical schools were for it; and he would not favor the passage of the bill, amended or unamended. So I would think that those who are interested in bringing about a condition in which more doctors would be educated and made available to the American people would not be persuaded by any argument by my good friend from Ohio, impressive as it may be, because until the medical schools change their position, he is not going to vote for the bill, whether we amend it with the pending amendment or with some other amendment, or whether it is not amended, until the—

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was impressed by the argument made by the Senator from Ohio that at the time he was for this bill we did not have before us the present over-all picture of the defense expenditures. I recall that he referred to the budget, and I desire to call his attention to the budget message, which I have in my hands. It is the budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. On page M-14 it has listed military services expenditures—not appropriations, but expenditures—for fiscal 1952. They are estimated at \$40,000,000,000 for 1952.

I should like to ask any Senator, is not that about what we estimate the expenditures for the military establishment will be in fiscal 1952? That is the expenditure on which we are working. Now we are making greater appropriations, but they cannot all be expended in fiscal 1952, so the argument that there was no fiscal situation before us which was as terrible as the present situation simply does not hold true, according to the record which was presented to the Congress for consideration by its committees.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the Senator's statement in that regard, and I submit, in addition, that if this country encounters an emergency with reference to a need for more doctors, I would not sell the United States of America short, and imply that she could not raise \$300,000,000 within a period of 5 years in order to meet the emergency.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wanted to answer the Senator's remarks about the budget, because that is the key to the argument on the amendment. The Senator points out that in March we contemplated an expenditure of \$40,000,000,000 for defense purposes. Yes, that was about my idea of what the military program was, and I felt at the time that we could probably go along with any meritorious domestic program. But the estimate of expenditure for next year is \$60,000,000,000, and in all probability the expenditures will amount to \$70,000,000,000 for the military alone, plus about \$25,000,000,000 of other expenditures. So the situation has completely changed, and I say that under the present threat we have no justification for starting any new program, unless it is directly related to the mobilization of the American Armed Forces.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I submit that nothing is more directly related to the mobilization effort than the provision of an adequate number of doctors, dentists, and nurses, not only for the military forces, but also for the civilian population.

The Senator from Ohio says this is a proposal to provide more doctors for war. Well, Mr. President, according to what he himself now says, there is greater imminence of war today than there was when he introduced the bill. But further than that, I call attention to the fact that the increase in the population of the country is just as much a factor in making necessary the supplying of more doctors and the personnel that would provide the opportunity for adequate medical attention and care, as is the rise in requirements of the military forces.

Actually fewer doctors are graduated today, by several hundred, than were graduated 50 years ago, and the population of our country today is probably two and one-half times, or nearly two and one-half times, what it was 45 or 50 years ago, when more doctors were being graduated than is the case today.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. For a question?

Mr. HUNT. For a question.

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma realize that our population is increasing daily between 6,500 and 7,000?

Mr. KERR. It is increasing at the rate of about 3,000,000 a year, and if I had a little time, and unanimous consent, I could figure out how much that was a day.

Mr. HUNT. Does the Senator realize that in 1905, 46 years ago, 512 more physicians were graduated than in the year 1949?

Mr. KERR. That is the information which the Senator from Oklahoma has, and to which he has just referred, and he appreciates his friends calling it to the attention of the Senate in specific detail.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. With an annual deficit in medical education of \$40,000,000, is not a \$10,000,000-a-year contribution, compared with the total capital investment, rather a small and meager start?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is not so well informed as he would like to be as to the actual deficit, or as to the actual ability of the various medical schools to meet a part or all of their own deficits. On the basis of what the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has said, certainly it is a small enough start; certainly it is not an excessive or extravagant start.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question at that point?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether the Senator is familiar with the fact that, in view of the remarks by the Senator from Ohio about the budget, the budget message carried a forewarning to the Congress that the President of the United States and the executive agencies were going to ask for obligatory authority in the amount of \$94,402,000,000? That was pointed out on page M-7 of the budget message, and the date of that was at the time of the President's message, in January. I think it was the 7th or 9th. At any rate, it was in the first week of January.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator from Minnesota expect the Senator from Ohio to have a full realization of March 12 of what is in the January message?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would certainly expect that he would have some general idea what was in the budget. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In view of the remarks of the Senator from Ohio, I wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma is aware of the fact that we were uncertain in January and March as to what our armed services strength would be. If I recall, the Senator from Ohio said it was something around 2,500,000 men at that time, and that on the date of March 9, 1951, the United States Senate,

following a debate which was fully participated in by the Senator from Ohio, passed the Universal Military Training and Selective Service Act, which set the strength of the armed services at 3,500,000 men, and which, placed no ceiling on the membership of the armed services in the event of world war.

I conclude by asking the Senator this question: Is there any secret about what the budget or what the military strength were supposed to be?

Mr. KERR. There was no secret as to what the actual, proposed, or suggested budget would be, and, certainly, information with reference to the provisions of the manpower bill was available to the Senate, the Nation, and the world. There was an effort on the part of some Members of the Senate to limit the size of the Armed Forces to 3,500,000 men, which, as I recollect, failed, and I believe the limitation then was fixed at 4,000,000. Then, following the conference on the bill, the limitation appeared at 5,000,000 men. So I would think that sometime between that date and now Senators received the information that the Armed Forces would likely exceed 2,500,000 or 2,700,000 men.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Just one final question. Would it be fair to state, in view of this information, which is a matter of record, that the membership of the United States Senate knew by March 12, 1951, first, that the selective service and universal training bill provided for manpower to the extent of at least three and a half million or more; and, second, that the budget message of the President projected expenditures for the fiscal year 1952 of over \$70,000,000,000? Would it be fair to say that every Member of the Senate knew that?

Mr. KERR. I indulge the presumption that every Senator has as much information as is available to the rank and file of the people of the Nation. I would resolve every doubt on the assumption that Senators do know what the facts are, and I shall indulge that presumption until Senators themselves disclaim all knowledge of that which has been so apparent.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is there any provision in the bill which places any military obligation upon anyone after he has obtained the advantage of the education which is provided by the bill?

Mr. KERR. There is none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does not the Senator feel that there should be? We are going to spend I do not know how many billion dollars—

Mr. KERR. A contemplated \$300,000,000 in 5 years, as a result of the enactment of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. For military purposes we will spend next year, as I have heard it stated, \$65,000,000,000, or some such figure. How can we operate the Army without men trained in the practice of medicine? Yet we are not making any provision whatever for educating men along those lines.

Mr. KERR. I say to my good friend from Colorado, in the first place, that we have laws which make these men subject to the draft.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, yes. Mr. KERR. We do have such laws.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They are past their draft days when they get out of medical school.

Mr. KERR. Whatever their age, they are eligible for the call of the military service when and as needed. I remind my good friend that the military cannot call a doctor who does not exist.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; of course it cannot.

Mr. KERR. I remind him, further, that, if I properly understand the law, the military can call any doctor who does exist.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Any doctor of any age.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. Having handled the physicians and dentists portion of the bill in the Armed Services Committee, I should like to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that the bill simply provides for the deferment of a medical or dental student until he has completed his course, but it does not exempt him in any sense of the word from service, regardless of age, when he finishes his schooling.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is the Senator from Oklahoma correct when he says that any doctor of any age can be drafted?

Mr. HUNT. Up to the age of 50 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is that true also of nurses?

Mr. HUNT. I have forgotten the age beyond which nurses cannot be drafted; I think it is 40 years.

Mr. KERR. I do not believe Congress should take a position that would establish the fact that any woman is 50 years of age.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think the Senator's observation is timely and important.

Mr. HUNT. Under the act we passed, any physician or any dentist in the United States, if he is physically fit, can be drafted until he reaches the age of 50 years.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to know the Senator's view as to what the fiscal situation in 1953 will be. Does the Senator think we can possibly balance the budget which is now presented to us, based on the expenditures and appropriations we have already made?

Mr. KERR. I do not blame my friend for chasing that rabbit.

Mr. TAFT. That is the whole point; it is the entire issue. I do not question the merits of the bill, so long as it does not contain the Senator's amendment. I think it is an extremely meritorious bill. But how can we afford to pass even

a meritorious bill when we face the possibility of a deficit next year of \$25,000,000,000?

Mr. KERR. How can the Senator possibly say that the budget of 1953 is the predominant question, when he has already told the Senate that he introduced the bill when the medical colleges were in favor of it, and that when he found that they had changed their position and were against it, he also was against it?

Mr. TAFT. I did not say that. I said if it were amended as the Senator proposes to amend it, and the colleges would be against it, I would be against it for the same reason, because it involves a technical point. But the real reason for opposing the bill is the fact that it means we will have to borrow so much more money, and there is no possible way I can see to meet the fiscal situation next year without serious danger to the country, either through more taxes or through borrowing money. I have not heard the Senator say that he believes there will be a deficit of \$25,000,000,000 next year.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma does not believe there is going to be a \$25,000,000,000 deficit next year. Let me say further to my good friend from Ohio, that if such a situation develops that the welfare of the country demand that we borrow money over and above the amount we derive from taxation, the Senator from Oklahoma would make it very clear that he believes that the danger of not borrowing the money to meet our national requirements would be far greater than the danger we would face by borrowing the additional amount of money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not logical to say that if the whole argument is to be that there is a deficit, then the same argument can be used as to the preparation of our national defense, because that is also part of the deficit?

Mr. KERR. That is the deficit.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. So, if the argument is that there is a deficit, it amounts to saying that in 1953 we are going to cut back our military program and not worry about what international communism is doing, for we shall have to balance the budget, regardless of whether the Russians take this country and the rest of the world.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his very pertinent observation.

I desire to say, further, that when a man needs a doctor, whether he is going to have a cash income 2 years later to meet his physical requirements or will have to borrow the money is a question certainly of academic interest, and certainly of some considerable concern—

Mr. HUMPHREY. And seldom discussed.

Mr. KERR. But it certainly is not a compelling consideration. I should hate to pass up the benefit I thought a doctor might give me, if I thought I would die without it, because of the fact that I did not know whether I was going to be able to meet the running expenses of my

household 2 years from now. Who knows? There might not be as many persons in the household 2 years from now if I did not have the doctor this year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Would the Senator be opposed to an amendment to the bill to have whatever contributions the Federal Government makes deducted from the military expenditures of the Nation?

Mr. KERR. I would not, because I do not know of any more important element in the military-preparedness program of the country than making provision for adequate medical, dental, and nurse personnel. We are confronted with this absolute reality. We know that the Armed Forces are going to obtain the required medical personnel and the required dental personnel. We know that the population of the country is increasing at the rate of 3,000,000 a year. We know then, both from the standpoint of the military forces drawing more of the too few doctors we already have, and the number of our people increasing, whereby the needs of the civilian population are going to be greater, that we are just ignoring realities when we fail to do that which will begin to make some adequate provision for the possibility of meeting the increasing requirements of the rank and file of our citizens to have available to them medical, technical, dental, and health personnel.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows that in the Office of Defense Mobilization, which, of course, is the organization set up by Congress to plan and mobilize the strength of our country for its defense, we have there the Health Resources Advisory Committee. In speaking of preparations to defend the country, we are told by that committee that unless we take some action now, there will be a deficit of 22,000 doctors by 1954, and that if we are going to have the doctors needed for the national defense, we must take steps such as the committee proposes in the pending bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma will yield, let me ask if the Senator from Alabama is aware of the fact—

Mr. KERR. I will yield to the Senator from Ohio in a moment. I want to thank the Senator from Alabama, and to say in response to his question that I cannot conceive that Senators should feel that we should be constrained, by consideration of the possibility of a financial deficit, to fail to do that without which we face the certainty of a deficit of 22,000 doctors, dentists, and so forth.

Mr. HILL. It is 22,000 doctors alone. It does not include dentists.

Mr. KERR. Twenty-two thousand doctors alone.

Mr. HILL. It is 22,000 doctors alone. And may I call the Senator's attention—

Mr. KERR. Just one moment, I have confidence that the Government, the Congress, and the Nation can meet our

financial commitments and requirements through processes available to us and through operations with which we are familiar, and with respect to which we are experienced, but nothing short of some such provision as this, or omnipotent intervention, with reference to which I do not believe we can have too great confidence—to meet the requirements for the doctors we will have to have 3 years from now, when that time comes no amount of ingenuity will be of avail to us.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I shall yield to the Senator from Alabama if he has another question, since he is on his feet.

Mr. HILL. The Senator, I am sure, realizes that during the past year the Armed Forces have called or drafted into the service, away from the civilian population, 11,000 doctors. The estimate is that one nonspecialist physician takes care of about a thousand laymen. In other words, we have taken already this year 11,000 doctors, which means 11,000,000 people must turn to already overburdened doctors for their medical care.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, now will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator says we will be 22,000 short of doctors in 1954. Under the bill, if passed, we will still be short 22,000 doctors, because this bill will not produce a doctor for 5 years from the time the program starts. The chance of the House passing it before 1952 is exceedingly remote, and it will certainly be 1957 before the doctors will be available, at which time presumably, the emergency will be over. At least the expenditures of the Government, I hope, will be very much reduced long before 1957. So I point out that this is not a bill to deal with the present emergency in meeting the Russian attack.

Mr. KERR. What the Senator from Ohio says would be in favor of an expanded bill. It could not be against the bill and the amendment, because they are calculated at least to begin to overcome the shortage. They are calculated at least to make a start toward reducing the deficit.

My good friend the Senator from Ohio would say that if he has a pain now, and the doctor is not going to cure the pain entirely, he does not want to have anything to do with him, no matter how much he might help, because probably after he has had the doctor, he will still have some pain anyway. I think that is a defeatist attitude which does not rest gracefully on the shoulders of my friend from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to make my position on this matter clear. A budget of \$90,000,000,000 can only be justified by one single danger, and that is an attack on the liberty of the people of the United States during the next 2 years. That is all. That is the emergency we face. In order to face that emergency successfully, apparently we have to undertake

extreme spending and deficit financing. I say that we can let every other emergency go until that emergency is met. If we get through the 2 years, then I think the Commission proposed to be created will know a great deal more about what a medical education ought to be than it does now.

Mr. KERR. But do not Senators realize that we are already in the presence of a deficit of doctors and that as the months go by the shortage will become more acute? I do not need any board of professors or anybody else to tell me that. I know that in Oklahoma there are areas in which a considerable percentage of new-born babies come into this world without having a doctor available to help take care either of the mother or the child.

I know that in considerable areas in Oklahoma—and I am persuaded that it is true throughout the length and breadth of the Nation—there are areas as large as some of the States of the Union, in which there is not a hospital bed, and in which there is not one doctor available to 15,000 people. I say to the Senator from Ohio that that condition prevails in vast areas, and will continue until the number of doctors is sufficient to supply the rural areas as well as the great centers of population.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator will recall, too, that the Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, so ably headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has submitted a report in which the attention of the Senate is called to a number of instances where officers and men of the Armed Forces on military bases and reservations do not have the doctors and the dentists they need and that they should have.

Does the Senator realize that today veterans' hospitals are closed, and beds in veterans' hospitals are unoccupied because the Government cannot get the doctors, the nurses, and the medical technicians needed to operate those facilities?

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the question of the Senator from Alabama. I will say to him that I am aware of those conditions. I am aware of those facts as a part of the basis for the position which I take in this matter.

Mr. President, I think we have adequate doctors and nurses in Korea; but I do not know when there may be another or greater Korea. I hope that my country never again will be faced with the tragedy and the requirements of all-out war. But I would be blind if I did not realize the possibility that it could materialize. I think I would be blind and derelict in the proper consideration of facts if I did not know that one of the respects in which our country is now least prepared to meet such a situation is the lack of adequate numbers of doctors, dentists, nurses, and health technicians. Should that awful day come when bombs are dropped on our cities, I say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that I would not want to live with

myself at that time if I had been instrumental in helping to prevent the enactment of a law which would at least start this country in the direction of preparing to meet the requirements of that hour with reference to adequate doctors, nurses, dentists, and technicians.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator recalls that according to all the studies and all the plans of our Civil Defense Administrator, the key man in such a situation as the Senator has pictured will be the doctor. During the past war the key man in civil defense was the Administrator. Now the whole situation has changed. If atomic bombs, with their radioactive properties and their bacteriological destruction should be dropped on our cities, the key man in the situation must be and will be the doctor.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate that statement from the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I will yield in a moment. With reference to adequate doctors, dentists, nurses, and health technicians, Mr. President, we are poverty-stricken; even without the requirements of the military forces, we are poverty-stricken in that regard with reference to the present requirements of the civilian population. We are utterly poverty-stricken with reference to the enormous increase in population which is taking place. If the awful tragedy to which we have referred, the bombing of our cities, were to occur, then we would be face to face with indescribable tragedy, one of the most horrible features of which would be total inadequacy of the necessary personnel of doctors, dentists, nurses, and medical technicians.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma has been making a very fine reply to the argument of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I ask the Senator if he does not recall that the Senator from Ohio pointed out that another reason we ought not to pass the bill, according to his logic, is that it will be some time before we realize any accomplishment. In other words, it will require quite a little time before conception results in fruition. It will be some time before the end product, namely, the doctor, is available. I wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma has given consideration to the fact that the very same argument which the Senator from Ohio uses as to the time lag between initiating the program and the time when we shall have more doctors could be used with respect to the program for guided missiles, or the program for airplane construction, or the program for the hydrogen bomb. Would it not apply to almost any such program? According to the evidence which I have heard, anywhere from 12 to 24 months are required before a new design for an airplane is on the assembly line. Our argument has been that we must project our program into

the future, and not delay, for fear that we may have a period of time in which we shall have no new equipment. Does not the same logic apply to the present argument?

Mr. KERR. It certainly does. Furthermore, that argument would prevent our moving to develop the armies of General Eisenhower in Europe. It would prevent every effort we make in the military preparedness program. Furthermore, if Abraham and his wonderful wife had been persuaded by any such argument as that, there would not be any "God's chosen people" today. They had gone along for a considerable time without having made some provision for posterity. If the fact that they had not already started had been a conclusive argument with them, it would have been an unthinkable tragedy. I thank God for a people who are not dismayed by the lack of provision of elements today, but who have the faith and the courage to move on to acquire what is not yet a reality, undismayed by the fact that the reality is not present with us.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. It was most appropriate for the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma to point out that in large sections of the country there are no medical facilities and no hospital facilities. That situation has been demonstrated to me very graphically in the past few weeks. The health subcommittee, of which I am chairman, is now considering a Senate bill. We have received thousands of letters from all over the country with regard to the bill. The writers of the great majority of letters point out, from their own knowledge and experience, that the sections of the country in which the writers live are completely devoid of either doctors, nurses, or hospitals.

There is another thing to remember, if I may ask the Senator to yield further. I know from personal experience that in the cities the lack of doctors and nurses presents a desperate situation. There is not a single hospital in the great city of New York, either public or private, which today does not have wards or wings shut down because of inability to obtain the required number of nurses.

Let me say to my friend the Senator from Oklahoma and to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that the situation is desperate throughout the country. If we add the peacetime or quasi-peacetime needs to that situation, because of the danger which the Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out, of attack from the air by atomic weapons, I think we are running a risk in allowing ourselves to go along complacently without making every attempt to train additional doctors and nurses. I very much hope that the Senate will see the situation in the proper light, and will vote for this bill.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from New York.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. President, I believe that the Congress has a responsibility. I believe that it is confronted with a reality, and not a theory. I believe that it is confronted with a situation which challenges the exercise of its responsibility on the basis of what the country needs, and not on the basis of what some medical school might want or might not want.

Mr. President, I have very great respect for the medical schools. I have the highest esteem and respect for the great medical college in my State. But, Mr. President, this country needs more doctors, more nurses, more dentists, and more health technicians. The Congress knows that to be so. We have too long delayed a start in the direction of meeting the need. I do not believe that we are going to be dismayed by what someone says about what the budget or the deficit will be 2 years from now.

What would the father of a child who needed a doctor do in the presence of an emergency? Would he have a caucus with his wife and say, "Do you think we are going to make enough cotton 2 years from now to pay the expense of the next arrival in our family? Must we be certain that we are going to be able to have what we need 2 or 3 years from now before we send for a doctor to take care of the child, who might not live if we do not do so?" I do not believe that the Senate will be controlled by that kind of argument.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. If I remember correctly, the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from New York served as governors of their respective States. I am certain that they have great influence in their States. My recommendation to them would be that they recommend to the States of New York and Oklahoma that they look after the doctors and nurses and look after the State universities, because that is exactly what we are doing in Indiana, and we are getting along splendidly. I recommend that the Senators, who have great influence, having been governors of their respective States, see to it that the States increase the number of students in medical schools and that the States increase the medical facilities and hospitals. To my mind that is the way to handle the problem.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. In a moment. I appreciate the remarks of the very able Senator from Indiana. I will say that if I were against this bill, I would probably be using the same line of ineffective argument. I call to the attention of the Senator from Indiana the fact that Northwestern University, which is not too far away from his State, in 1950 had 2,103 applications for admission to their medical school, and were able to accept only 128; that Cornell Medical School admitted 80 freshmen from 2,870 applicants; that Columbia admitted 120 from 2,800 applicants; that Temple admitted 125 from 3,089 applicants; that Yale, which is the alma mater of my dis-

tinguished friend from Ohio—and I want to say that I never had the benefit of a Yale education and neither have I ever been limited or bound by one—admitted 65 out of 1,401 applicants. Tulane took 128 out of 2,000; Boston took 72 out of 1,875.

I make the statement based on my conviction and belief that there is not a medical school in this country which is not today turning away from 4 to 10 times as many students as it accepts into its freshman classes. I believe, Mr. President, that we would do well to give most favorable consideration to the passage of this bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. In connection with the statement which the Senator from Oklahoma has made, which is entirely correct, that every medical school now functioning in the United States has a much greater number of applicants than it can possibly receive into its medical schools, I ask the distinguished Senator if that does not show that there is a great pool of young men and women who have completed premedical and pre-dental training, which perhaps has cost them a great deal of money, the expenditure of a great deal of energy, and which has shown their desire to serve mankind as doctors or dentists or as specialists of one kind or another; and that it is a pity to have all that partly trained manpower and womanpower turned away, as is being done under the present situation?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Florida is eminently and unquestionably correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. For a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to reply to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. KERR. I should like to yield the floor. Then the Senator from New York may make his reply.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma will not agree that what is now happening is that the States are compelled to take over many medical schools, a development which has been bitterly opposed by the American Medical Association? The State of New York has had to take over two great medical schools, the Medical School of Long Island University and the Medical School of Syracuse University. The State took them over because those two great institutions, which have been operating for generations and which have been graduating doctors who are practicing all over the country—not only in New York, but Indiana, Arizona, Oklahoma, and California—were unable to continue.

Mr. KERR. The situation is acute, not only with reference to schools that cannot accept any applicants, but with reference to all schools that can take a greater enrollment under present conditions. As the Senator from Florida has pointed out, the students who have been trained for either dental or medical

courses not only have had such training at cost to them in time and money, but also in cost to their States and to the taxpayers of the States which support the schools in which they received their training.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUNT. Is the Senator from Oklahoma aware of the fact that in my area of the United States, in the Rocky Mountain States, there are 10 States without a single dental school, which means that there are 10,000,000 people without a dental school?

Mr. KERR. I was not aware of that fact, but it further illustrates the crisis that exists today. As I see it, if we are not moved and influenced by it, it could only be because we refuse to recognize its significance.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. HUNT. Does not the Senator from Oklahoma realize that it is necessary that most schools limit their enrollment at least up to 90 percent of students from their home State?

Mr. KERR. Generally that is true.

Mr. HUNT. Boys from States not having medical or dental schools hardly ever have a chance of getting a medical or dental education?

Mr. KERR. That is correct. In that regard, information which I have before me indicates that a majority even of the students who come as medical students from outside a State, after having been educated, remain in the State where they get their education.

Mr. HUNT. Does not the Senator agree with me that society owes an obligation to the people of the United States who wish to pursue the study of medicine or dentistry to afford them the opportunity by providing facilities, just as is done for agriculture, education, or any other course of study, excepting medicine and dentistry?

Mr. KERR. I fully agree with the Senator from Wyoming, and I say further, that while I support every appropriation my Government has made to improve the health and breeding of livestock and the development of finer strains of livestock, I have the feeling that the matter of making it possible for the country and the people to have an adequate number of doctors and dentists and nurses available is of almost comparable importance to the other things to which I have referred.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. HUNT. Do we hear any criticism at all of the appropriations we have made since 1878 to the land-grant colleges to promote what the Senator has just stated, namely, the study of agriculture, the breeding of livestock, the diseases of livestock, and similar subjects? We make the appropriations every year. Apparently we take a different view when it comes to a proposal to take care of human beings.

Mr. KERR. We find Senators who because medical schools are opposed to it cannot support the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not wish to detain the Senator any longer, but I should like to commend him on the very fine speech which he has made this afternoon. He spoke eloquently about Abraham and his wife. I hope he will close his speech with the words: "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for that appropriate conclusion.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor, unless other Senators wish to ask me questions.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, before we get ready to take a recess, I wish to state that I desire to compliment the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] on the speech he has just made.

I am one who does not believe that we can measure health in terms of dollars. If we expect to keep our country strong, we had better keep strong physically; and we cannot do that unless we have a proper number of doctors available.

Mr. President, it is evident that we cannot complete action on the bill this evening.

Therefore, I now ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, debate on the amendments and the bill be limited as follows: On the amendments, 20 minutes to a side, with the time to be controlled by the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], respectively, in the event that he is opposed to the amendment; or, if he is not, then by the acting minority leader or any Senator whom he may designate; that debate on motions and appeals be limited likewise; and that debate on the bill be limited to 30 minutes to a side, to be controlled by the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the acting minority leader or any Senator whom he may designate, respectively; and that all amendments to the bill must be germane.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I have checked so far as I can among Senators on this side of the aisle, and I believe the proposed arrangement is satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the proposed agreement? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That during the further consideration of Senate bill 337, the Emergency Professional Health Training Act of 1951, debate upon any amendment or motion (including appeals) shall be limited to not exceeding 40 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of any such amendment or motion and Mr. PASTORE: *Provided*, That if Mr. PASTORE is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the acting minority leader or someone designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment or motion that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That debate upon the question of the final passage of the bill shall

be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. PASMORE and the acting minority leader or someone designated by him.

THE CICERO RIOTS AND THEIR AFTERMATH

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, these are days of testing. The great principles of individual freedom under which our Republic has developed are clashing with the methods of the police state. By our acts, we show whether or not we really believe in the American ideal of equality of opportunity and of equal justice under the law.

It is easy to uphold these principles in the abstract or when they are threatened elsewhere by others. All this costs nothing; but it is not worth much, for no one disagrees.

The test is whether one is willing to apply these principles close at home in situations where it hurts and in which one is directly or indirectly involved.

In times past I have criticized situations in the southern States which I have felt showed a general refusal to treat black men and women as possessing human dignity. While I have pointed out that the North as well as the South had similar faults, I know that since the incidents complained of occurred in the South, my brethren there have naturally felt that the criticisms cost me nothing, for the South was far away from my home. Similarly, I have criticized the gross denial of human liberties behind the iron curtain and the terrible injustices of the Russian police state. This criticism has been true, but it also has cost me nothing.

I have been and am proud of my own State of Illinois, which has given to the country and to the ages the consummate expressions of pity, compassion, and brotherly love in the persons of Abraham Lincoln and Jane Addams. I feel that these two, who sprang from our prairies, represent what the people of Illinois love and hunger for in the deepest recesses of their souls.

But events in my own State and in my own county during these last 3 months have so developed that I cannot in good conscience keep silent any longer, and on the floor of this august body I must quite briefly relate a shameful story of events and take my stand about them.

In early June of this year a Negro family rented an apartment in a flat building in Cicero, a hitherto all-white city lying close to Chicago. I know this city well. Its homes are well kept and its lawns trim. I would have trusted my own life with the kindly families who live there. But when the first move was made by the Negro family to enter their new home law-enforcement officials themselves were known to have interposed threats and resistance. Then, when a Federal court injunction removed this obstacle, a huge mob of at least 6,000 people quickly gathered to prevent the Negro family from moving in. They gutted the building by incendiary flares, by bricks and home-made hand grenades, and by other weapons. Neither the police nor the sheriff's deputies made any real effort to protect the attacked or to restrain the crowd. Finally, after nearly 3 days,

the National Guard was called out and a semblance of order was restored.

This was incredible enough, but what followed was just as startling. A grand jury was called to hear the case. While it indicted the local chief of police, it did not indict any other of the law enforcement officials or rioters or those who directly or indirectly incited the mob action. It indicted instead the woman who had rented her building to Negroes, the real estate firm which had negotiated the leases, and the Negro lawyer, Mr. George Leighton, who had obtained the Federal injunction in the court of Judge John P. Barnes restraining the Cicero police from preventing the Negro family from moving in. In all this the grand jury seemed to follow the cynical maxim that "not the murderer, but the murdered is guilty."

I am confident that this action of the grand jury was against the desires of my close personal friend and my long-time political associate, State's Attorney, John S. Boyle, whom I know to be a kind and tolerant man. I believe that it does not represent the true feelings of the responsible and fair citizens of Cicero itself, who, after an opportunity for calmer reflection on the whole incident, must share the regret and shame which we all feel over the tragic outbreak.

But this action of the jury, taken in cold blood, is a denial of every principle of American decency. It violates our basic regard for justice and human dignity. Coming at a time when we are seeking the friendship of the darker-skinned peoples of Asia and Africa, it will inevitably be used against us by the masters of the Kremlin.

Of course, the Cicero riots and the action of the grand jury are not typical of the people of Illinois or of Cook County. We are people of many racial stocks and of diverse cultural and religious ties, who have in the main learned to live and work together and to respect each other.

Even with all the abuses which mar our lives, this is still the country where men lead a far better life than in any other country on the globe, and where, under freedom, the opportunities for further advancement are greatest. But we need constantly to make it better, and it is by that effort that we shall more nearly achieve the ideals of equality of opportunity and of justice which we profess, and at the same time give the real answer to the exaggerated propaganda of the Communists.

Because of the situation created by the events in Cicero and by the indictments handed down by the first grand jury, we need now to turn to affirmative action.

I believe we should rejoice, therefore, that Attorney General J. Howard McGrath has decided to investigate the case to determine whether Federal laws have been violated, as I believe they have been, and whether Federal officials can properly assist in dealing with the problem. This appears to be another case where cooperation by all levels of government is desirable and necessary in order to maintain order and to mete out justice. If there was a criminal conspiracy, if the

riot was organized and planned, if the law enforcement officials aided and abetted the rioters and denied equal protection of the law to the Negro family and the property where they hoped to live, then such people would seem to be the fittest subjects for prosecution, rather than laying vindictive penalties upon those, many of them youngsters, who were duped into a mob action which they must now regret. I do not presume to try to influence the courts in the pending cases or any future grand jury. But all of us must join in urging that a thorough and fair investigation be carried through, which will be directed at the real wrong-doers and at preventing any recurrence of mob action.

Beyond this, however, and perhaps even more important, I hope that efforts may be made in Cicero and in the entire Chicago community to get at the underlying causes of this outbreak. We must strive to remove the fears and misunderstandings of the various groups involved. City and State officials and private builders will, I hope, renew their drive to relieve the desperate housing shortage; and the denials of equal opportunity in education, in employment, and in other aspects of community life must be ended. Meanwhile, the task of reconciliation must be carried forward at an increasing pace.

What we need in this country, my own State included, is a greater realization that the interests which all of us have in common are far greater than the points of difference between us. This is true for Democrats, Republicans, and independents; for the native-born and the foreign stock; for the Catholics, Protestants, and Jews; for northerners, southerners, and westerners; and for the black and white, as well. All of us are inheritors of our American traditions. There are many real differences and conflicts of interests. We cannot ignore these. But I ask that we meet them with understanding, not with hate; with orderly procedures, not with mob violence. Let us not tear up the foundations of civil society, but, instead, labor in friendship to deal with our common problems. Perhaps something of the spirit of the old Greek dramatist, who wrote over 2,300 years ago, would help us all:

What else is wisdom? What of man's endeavor

Or God's high grace, so lovely and so great? To stand from fear set free, to breathe and wait;

To hold a hand uplifted over hate; And shall not loveliness be loved forever?

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. What bill will the Senate consider after we finish the bill for Federal aid for medical education?

Mr. MCFARLAND. We shall consider the proposed modification of the so-called Capehart amendment to the economic controls bill, Senate bill 2170, to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask several questions of the majority leader, for the RECORD: Do I correctly understand that the executive calendar which contains the name of the Ambassador to India will go over until next week?

Mr. MCFARLAND. Yes; I shall try to inform the Senator in advance when we shall take it up.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It will not be taken up before the first of next week. Is that correct?

Mr. MCFARLAND. It will not be taken up on tomorrow or on Friday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Can the Senator from Arizona inform me whether he has made up his mind whether there will be a session on Friday?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I have not made up my mind to the contrary.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Arizona has some hopes that there may not be a session on Friday. Is that correct?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I do not know. We shall have the amendment of the controls act before us. I have not given any thought to not having a session on Friday. If we could have completed action on the amendment to the controls act and could have made more progress, perhaps we would have deserved a day off. However, I shall be glad to think about it and to talk with other Senators.

Of course, I am trying to have the Congress get away; as for myself, I should like to get some Arizona sunshine.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be happy to have the Senator from Arizona do so.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HOLLAND was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate tomorrow and Friday.

REPORT BY ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE ON INTERNATIONAL LOAD LINE CONVENTION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive Q, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a report by the Acting Secretary of State setting forth the texts of a proposal by the Government of Canada and a proposal by the Government of Australia relating to changes in the delimitation of certain of the seasonal zones established in Annex II of the International Load Line Convention, signed at London on July 5, 1930. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the report, and the report, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
October 3, 1951.

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Acting Secretary of State setting forth the texts of a proposal by the Govern-

ment of Canada and a proposal by the Government of Australia relating to changes in the delimitation of certain of the seasonal zones established in Annex II of the International Load Line Convention, signed at London on July 5, 1930.

In accordance with the recommendation made in the Acting Secretary's report, I request that the Senate give its advice and consent to acceptance by the United States of America of the two proposed modifications of the convention.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nominations of two postmasters, which nominating messages were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Howard E. Fleischer, and sundry other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George L. Robertson, of Missouri, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri vice Drake Watson, term expired;

Charles S. Vigil, of Colorado, to be United States attorney for the district of Colorado vice Max M. Bulkeley, term expired; and

Lucius Marshall Walker, Jr., of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia, vice Robert L. Allworth, retired.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

A report (Ex. Rept. No. 2) on the nomination of Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Nepal, heretofore reported from that committee.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE KARL STEFAN, OF NEBRASKA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives (H. Res. 444), which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
October 3, 1951.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. KARL STEFAN, a Representative from the State of Nebraska.

Resolved, That a committee of 11 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and trans-

mit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, the sudden passing of the Honorable KARL STEFAN, my very close friend, came as a real shock to me and to all other Members of Congress, especially to those of the Nebraska delegation. On behalf of myself and my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I wish to say a few words with reference to this sad event.

KARL STEFAN was the dean of our Nebraska delegation. He had been in Congress since 1935, and had advanced in the House of Representatives to a position of real influence and stature. He was highly respected by the leaders of both political parties, and he entered into the councils of the leaders of both parties.

KARL STEFAN was not born in this country; he was born in Bohemia, or what is now, I believe, a part of Czechoslovakia. He came to the United States in early life.

I think he never lost a feeling of gratitude and wonder that he, an immigrant boy, should attain a position in the Congress of the United States, the most powerful legislative body in the world.

I know there was no more sterling patriot than KARL STEFAN. Perhaps that was partly because he was not born here, and therefore he realized even more fully than do some of us how priceless is the possession of our American citizenship.

He was a faithful servant of the people of Nebraska and the people of the Nation.

All of us will miss him greatly.

He was known as one of the hardest working Members of the House of Representatives and of the House Appropriations Committee. He was always on the job. Undoubtedly the hard work he has done over the years contributed to his untimely passing.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, KARL STEFAN was one of the closest friends I had in the House of Representatives. I served with him during the entire 14 years I was in the House of Representatives. During 12 of those 14 years I sat by his side on the House Appropriations Committee. During eight of those years our offices were next door to each other. Our congressional districts were contiguous. The northern boundary of his district was the northern line of Nebraska, and the southern boundary of my district was the same line, namely, the boundary line between Nebraska and South Dakota.

Members who have served with another Member for many years, and who have had offices next door to each other, well understand what I mean when I say that the death of KARL STEFAN was a very personal loss to me.

The last time I saw Karl was on the floor of the Senate, not very many days ago, when he came here to ask about some matter, and sat with me a while and visited with me.

KARL STEFAN was a man of world viewpoint. He was born in Bohemia. He came to the United States in his

mother's arms when he was less than 1 year of age.

He came to love this land, though, more than any other land in all the world.

KARL STEFAN had a tremendous grip on the people of his district. There are many persons in the southern part of my own congressional district who knew KARL STEFAN well. They regarded him as their champion because they, too, had been born in Bohemia, or what is now Czechoslovakia.

The people of Nebraska regarded KARL STEFAN as their champion.

Our distinguished colleague, the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY], and I were visiting this morning at the hospital, where the junior Senator from Nebraska is temporarily staying for his own health. I think it probably is not out of place for me to say here that Senator WHERRY said to me this morning, "KARL STEFAN could have been elected in Nebraska on any ticket."

Mr. President, the people of KARL STEFAN's district, regardless of their political affiliation, had faith in him. He was a tower of strength to good government in Nebraska. The large vote he repeatedly received was evidence of the confidence the people had in him. He was regarded, not merely as a champion of the people of Nebraska in the House of Representatives, but also as a champion of the interests of the Czechs, who looked upon him as one of the great people of their nationality.

He was also regarded as a champion by the people of the Philippines, for during the Spanish-American War he served in the National Guard in the Philippines; and, as a result of his service there, he came to take a great deal of interest in the Philippines and in the various legislative proposals affecting the Philippines. So it was that he was awarded medals by the Philippine Government, those medals being presented to him by Mr. Carlos Romulo, in behalf of the people of the Philippines.

KARL STEFAN served for many years as ranking minority member of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the District of Columbia; and during the Eightieth Congress he served as its chairman. Because of that, he took a deep interest in the affairs of the District of Columbia. The tributes which have been paid to KARL STEFAN by the Washington newspapers last night and today are evidence of the fact that he was loved not only by the people of Nebraska, not only by the people of the Philippines, not only by the people of Czechoslovakia, but also by the people of the District of Columbia.

Those of us who worked closely with KARL STEFAN know something of the reason for that.

He was, as the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] has said, a hard-working man. He was conscientious. No breath of scandal ever came anywhere near his door. He did what he thought was right and for the good of his country.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate, I met KARL STEFAN. I know of no man who

commanded greater respect among those with whom he worked. Everyone who knew KARL STEFAN loved him. He was a man of ability and integrity. His death means a great loss to our country. I wish to extend my deep sympathy to his widow and family. I am sorry that a great man, a great American, has been prematurely taken from us.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words of tribute to the deceased Representative STEFAN, of Nebraska, I did not serve with him in the House, but I had a high regard for him. I have been on social terms with him, and we have discussed public questions together. I think that Representative STEFAN, having been a native of Bohemia, and having come to this country and become a great American citizen and having served for 17 years in the Congress, may justly be said to have achieved a great success, and I desire to pay tribute to his memory.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I had the privilege of serving with Representative STEFAN in the House of Representatives for a number of years. There were few men in the House of Representatives who were better liked or more highly respected by Members on both sides of the aisle than he. He was a very busy Member of Congress, but he always had time to listen to the problems of any other Representative and, as has been stated, he truly had a national and an international view. As a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, he was as much interested in the projects of the South, the East, and the West, as he was in those of his own section. Congress has, unfortunately, lost one of its best Members.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, while I served as Assistant Secretary of State, I had the privilege of working very closely with Representative STEFAN, during his tenure as chairman of the State Department Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, and I subscribe fully to everything which has been said by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who by his remarks shows how intimately he was acquainted with the late Representative.

Mr. President, I never knew a man who gave me more evidence of loving his country, in the best sense of that phrase, than did KARL STEFAN. He would meet me at any hour of the day or night, at early breakfast or late at night, to help resolve any kind of problem which might have a bearing on his responsibilities in connection with State Department appropriation bills. He approached these matters without partisanship, and solely from the standpoint of his desire to do the best he could for the people of the United States. I may say that I found him a fine friend, willing to take a stand courageously when need be on certain difficult questions, often when he found few supporters.

Mr. President, I may say I never met anyone in the State Department who knew as much about certain factors of the Department's operations as did Representative STEFAN. He had studied

them, I believe, over a period of perhaps as much as 15 or 20 years, during his service on the Committee on Appropriations.

We have lost one of our finest colleagues in Congress. I am glad to join this spontaneous expression of respect for his memory, and to have had my sympathies so well expressed by the majority leader for his wife and his daughter, with whom I had often corresponded, and for his grandchildren, with whom I became acquainted through my friendship with Representative STEFAN.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I wish to thank Senators for the kind words they have had to say with reference to our friend from Nebraska, the late Representative KARL STEFAN. I regret exceedingly that the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], is not present today to join in these tributes, but I have spoken for him in anything I have had to say. I think it would be perfectly proper for the acting minority leader to say a few words at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am confident that on this occasion the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], would be much more adequate to express the feelings of the members of the minority regarding Representative STEFAN than I can possibly be. I am sure that if he were present he would fittingly pay tribute to the late Representative, not only as the leader of the minority in the Senate, but also as a personal friend.

As an expression of my own personal feelings, I may say that my contacts with Representative STEFAN on conference committees, on the floor of the House, and on the floor of the Senate, were such that I grew to have great respect and admiration for him, and I know how much the citizens of Nebraska and all of us will miss his wise counsel.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I ask to have read and immediately considered.

The resolution (S. Res. 220) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. KARL STEFAN, late a Representative from the State of Nebraska.

Resolved, That a committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). The Chair will name the committee provided for in the second resolving clause at a later date.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes

p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, October 4, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, October 3 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Jack Gorrie, of Washington, to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of branch, arm, or service:

Lt. Col. Gerald Joseph Greeve, O29576, Judge Advocate General's Corps, United States Army.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States:

Maj. William May Myers, O32160, United States Army.

Maj. John William Gorn, O22200, United States Army.

Maj. James Franklin Bishop, O22231, United States Army.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate, October 3 (legislative day of October 1), 1951:

POSTMASTERS

Ralph J. McDonald, Berthoud, Colo.
Guy V. Kingree, Lomoketown, Pa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who art always calling us to be partners with Thee in a holy alliance and in establishing peace and good will among men, we penitently confess that mankind is often so divided against itself and frequently so far astray from Thee.

Grant that all the members of the human family may be inspired with a more earnest quest for a closer union with one another and a more intimate fellowship with Thee.

We beseech Thee that in the realm of human relationships we may not be merely satisfied with cultivating and practicing the spirit of tolerance but may we strive to widen the areas of cooperation and helpfulness, with none seeking its own selfish advantage and welfare.

We pray that in spite of the many reverses and obstacles, which we are encountering, we may have the patience and courage to believe and hope that our troubled world is moving toward a new synthesis, when there will be further and more lasting reconciliations and agreements among the nations of the earth.

We thank Thee for the noble life and character of Thy servant who gave himself so wholeheartedly to this ministry of peace and reconciliation. Thou hast

called him into Thy nearer presence. His sun went down while it was yet day only to rise again in eternal glory. May the members of his bereaved family receive the consolation of Thy grace. Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On September 28, 1951:

H. R. 4914. An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 335. Joint resolution amending an act making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

On October 1, 1951:

H. J. Res. 333. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 97. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee;

S. 466. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St. Louis, Mo.;

S. 582. An act for the relief of Emma Burr;

S. 590. An act for the relief of Francesco Gaber;

S. 606. An act for the relief of Fede Vita Guzzardi;

S. 634. An act for the relief of Stela S. Ransier;

S. 635. An act for the relief of Hans Lenk;

S. 659. An act for the relief of Ritsuko Chojin;

S. 702. An act for the relief of Joseph Emanuel Winger;

S. 715. An act for the relief of Ana Cobo Alonso;

S. 781. An act to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Army and the United States Air Force;

S. 905. An act for the relief of Margaret A. Ushkova-Rosanoff;

S. 970. An act for the relief of Esther V. Worley;

S. 1048. An act for the relief of Myrtle Harding;

S. 1158. An act for the relief of Takako Kitamura Dalluge;

S. 1177. An act for the relief of Misako Konoshita;

S. 1199. An act for the relief of Julie Nicola Frangou;

S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vera Oumancoff;

S. 1283. An act to remove the limitation on the numerical strength of the White House Police force;

S. 1342. An act to amend acts relating to garagekeepers and livermen's liens and the enforcement thereof in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1411. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to issue duplicate checks without requiring bond when such checks of the Post Office Department are lost while in the custody of the United States or lost without fault of owner or holder;

S. 1415. An act to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948;

S. 1421. An act for the relief of Masako Sugiyama;

S. 1450. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands owned by the United States of America for certain privately owned lands;

S. 1464. An act for the relief of Peter Therkelsen Kirwan and Ernest O'Gorman Kirwan;

S. 1499. An act for the relief of Georgette Sato;

S. 1517. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1897, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes," as amended, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to sell without advertisement national forest timber in amounts not exceeding \$2,000 in appraised value;

S. 1541. An act for the relief of Dr. Francis S. N. Kowk;

S. 1629. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis; and for other purposes;

S. 1640. An act for the relief of Cathy Dana Besser;

S. 1686. An act for the relief of Albert Goldman, postmaster at New York, N. Y.;

S. 1800. An act for the relief of Dr. Jacob Griffel;

S. 1899. An act to further define the national transportation policy;

S. 1952. An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes;

S. 1956. An act to amend section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 and sections 6 and 14 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, and for other purposes;

S. 1967. An act to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes;

S. 1970. An act for the relief of Louis E. Gabel;

S. 1994. An act to authorize the use of the incomplete submarine *Ulua* as a target for explosive tests, and for other purposes;

S. 2007. An act for the relief of Sharon A. Gates;

S. 2025. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), to increase the amount available as an emergency relief fund for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges damaged by floods or other catastrophes;

S. 2027. An act for the relief of Leo Kieve;

S. 2079. An act to authorize the contribution of \$12,000,000 to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund;

S. 2080. An act for the relief of Inooka Kazumi;

S. 2085. An act to further amend section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to underwriting and dealing in securities issued by the Central Bank for Cooperatives;

S. 2091. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to repeal the provisions therein for additional subscriptions on behalf of the United States to the capital stock of the Federal land banks;

S. 2128. An act to provide for the merger of two or more national banking associations and for the merger of State banks with national banking associations, and for other purposes;

S. 2158. An act for the relief of Michiyo Chiba; and

S. J. Res. 104. An act to assist in the rehabilitation of the economy of South Korea, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5113) entitled "An act to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 52-8.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1952

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KENNEDY, until November 15, on account of official business.

THIRTY-SECOND REPORT TO CONGRESS ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 227)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the thirty-second report to Congress on lend-lease operations, for the period from April 1, 1950, to March 31, 1951, inclusive.

During the period covered by this report, a supplement to the lend-lease

settlement arrangement of April 15, 1948, was signed with Brazil and final settlement commitments were signed with Colombia, Costa Rica, and Mexico, while Bolivia, Ecuador, and El Salvador liquidated the amounts which were outstanding on their lend-lease accounts incurred within the terms of their respective lend-lease agreements.

The major development in lend-lease activities during this period was the resumption on January 15, 1951, of formal across-the-table negotiations with representatives of the U. S. S. R. In preparation for these negotiations, the Secretary of State discussed with me the major points involved and I approved his recommendations, the objectives of which are just and reasonable compensation to the United States for the civilian-type lend-lease supplies remaining on hand in the Soviet Union at the end of the war; the return to the United States, pursuant to a request submitted in accordance with the provisions of the master lend-lease agreement, of those defense articles transferred to the U. S. S. R. under lend-lease procedures which I have determined to be useful to our Government; and the payment by the U. S. S. R. of satisfactory compensation to United States owners of patented processes which are being used in the U. S. S. R. in oil refineries supplied under the lend-lease program. Despite the continued efforts of the United States negotiators to reach a satisfactory settlement, no substantial agreement on several of the major issues has yet been achieved. These negotiations are described more fully in the report itself.

Other lend-lease activities during the period covered by this report include negotiations for settlements with other countries and, also, the management of fiscal, administrative, and policy matters arising from and related to the lend-lease settlements which already have been concluded with certain of our allies of World War II.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 3, 1951.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 97. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 466. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Army certain property in St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 582. An act for the relief of Emma Burr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 590. An act for the relief of Francesco Gaber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 606. An act for the relief of Fede Vita Guzzardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 634. An act for the relief of Stela S. Ransler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 635. An act for the relief of Hans Lenk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 659. An act for the relief of Ritsuko Chojin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 702. An act for the relief of Joseph Emanuel Winger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 715. An act for the relief of Ana Cobo Alonso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 781. An act to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Army and the United States Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 905. An act for the relief of Margaret A. Ushkova-Rosanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 970. An act for the relief of Esther V. Worley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1048. An act for the relief of Myrtle Harding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1158. An act for the relief of Takako Kitamura Dalluge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1177. An act for the relief of Misako Konoshita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1199. An act for the relief of Julie Nicola Frangou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1274. An act for the relief of Vera Oumancoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1283. An act to remove the limitation on the numerical strength of the White House Police force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1342. An act to amend acts relating to garagekeepers and liverymen's liens and the enforcement thereof in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1411. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to issue duplicate checks without requiring bond when such checks of the Post Office Department are lost while in the custody of the United States or lost without fault of owner or holder; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1415. An act to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1421. An act for the relief of Masako Sugiyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1450. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands owned by the United States of America for certain privately owned lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1464. An act for the relief of Peter Therkelsen Kirwan and Ernest O'Gorman Kirwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1517. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1897, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes," as amended, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to sell without advertisement national-forest timber in amounts not exceeding \$2,000 in appraised value; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1541. An act for the relief of Dr. Francis S. N. Kowk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1629. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to permit the interstate movement, for immediate slaughter, of domestic animals which have reacted to a test for paratuberculosis or which, never having been vaccinated for brucellosis, have reacted to a test for brucellosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1640. An act for the relief of Cathy Dana Besser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1686. An act for the relief of Albert Goldman, postmaster at New York, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1800. An act for the relief of Dr. Jacob Griffel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1899. An act to further define the national transportation policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1952. An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1967. An act to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1970. An act for the relief of Louis E. Gabel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2007. An act for the relief of Sharon A. Gates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2025. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), to increase the amount available as an emergency relief fund for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges damaged by floods or other catastrophes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2027. An act for the relief of Leo Kieve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2079. An act to authorize the contribution of \$12,000,000 to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 2091. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to repeal the provisions therein for additional subscriptions on behalf of the United States to the capital stock of the Federal land banks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2128. An act to provide for the merger of two or more national banking associations and for the merger of State banks with national banking associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2158. An act for the relief of Michiyo Chiba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution to assist in the rehabilitation of the economy of South Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the recognition and endorsement of the World Metallurgical Congress.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1183. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of public airports in the Territory of Alaska," as amended.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On October 2, 1951:

H. R. 579. An act for the relief of Hendryk Kempiski;

H. R. 580. An act for the relief of Kwang Myeng Chu;

H. R. 662. An act for the relief of William O. Stevens;

H. R. 676. An act for the relief of Mrs. Aimee Hoyningen-Huene;

H. R. 710. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Chow Hsia and her son, Sven Erik Hsia;

H. R. 711. An act for the relief of George Lukes;

H. R. 744. An act for the relief of Wladimir Peter Lewicki; Mrs. Heedwige Lewicki, and George Wladimir Lewicki;

H. R. 804. An act for the relief of Sisters Maria DeRubertis, Agnese Cerina, Marianna Bonifacio, Dina Bonini, and Edvige Gasparini;

H. R. 901. An act to provide for the admission of Janet and Daisy Wong to the United States;

H. R. 1102. An act for the relief of Emilio Torres;

H. R. 1128. An act for the relief of Harvey McFarland and Laurence Anthony Warnock;

H. R. 1136. An act for the relief of Sister Natalie (Marie Palagyi) and Sister Alice (Elizabeth Slachta);

H. R. 1203. An act to authorize officers designated by the Secretary of the Air Force to take action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to Government property;

H. R. 1253. An act for the relief of Jack A. Witham;

H. R. 1420. An act for the relief of Dr. Eugen Jose Singer and Mrs. Frieda Singer;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of David Lee Harrigan;

H. R. 1598. An act for the relief of Hanoh Sarapanovschi (also known as Hanoh Charat), Gizela (Gizele) Sarapanovschi (nee Levy) and Philippe Sarapanovschi;

H. R. 1816. An act for the relief of Shoemon Takano;

H. R. 1818. An act for the relief of Hego Fuchino;

H. R. 2165. An act for the relief of Matthew Terry;

H. R. 2444. An act for the relief of James A. Vines;

H. R. 2459. An act for the relief of Ollie O. Evans, Jr.;

H. R. 2498. An act for the relief of Marianne and Michel Speelman;

H. R. 2562. An act amending section 437 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 2621. An act for the relief of Mrs. Giulia Di Gaetano Coccia;

H. R. 2745. An act to amend section 2801 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 2807. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Poborski;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Shizu Terauchi Parks;

H. R. 3026. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Ferrari;

H. R. 3128. An act for the relief of Elaine Dovico;

H. R. 3436. An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport grain between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951;

H. R. 3585. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy certain property located at Decatur, Ill.;

H. R. 3818. An act for the relief of Yutaka Nakaeda;

H. R. 3895. An act for the relief of Ethel Cristeta Berner;

H. R. 3932. An act to provide vocational rehabilitation training for veterans with compensable service-connected disabilities who served on or after June 27, 1950;

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of five sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary;

H. R. 4121. An act for the relief of Rafael Alemany;

H. R. 4127. An act for the relief of Mrs. Doris Ellen Young;

H. R. 4463. An act for the relief of Nadine Carol Heslip;

H. R. 4688. An act for the relief of Cecelia Wahls; and

H. R. 4756. An act for the relief of George Francis Hammers.

On October 3, 1951:

H. R. 5013. An act to authorize the President to proclaim regulations for preventing collisions at sea; and

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution providing for the recognition and endorsement of the World Metallurgical Congress.

THE LATE HON. KARL STEFAN

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Giver of all life has placed His

hand on one of our number and has said: Come here, my son, your labors are over. Enter into the reward that I have prepared for you.

His passing from our midst has torn our hearts with grief and we miss him greatly. He was such a gentle, kindly, loyal, and good man. It is difficult to announce that the Honorable KARL STEFAN died at the George Washington Hospital in the city of Washington on Tuesday afternoon, October 2, 1951.

The rise of KARL STEFAN and his election to Congress is an inspiring story of what can happen in this Republic. He was born on March 1, 1884, on a farm near Zebrakov, Bohemia, and immigrated to the United States in 1885. His parents settled in Omaha, Nebr., where Karl attended the public schools. Later he went to night school. He was successful in all his many undertakings including that of telegraph operator, news writer, reporter, editor, radio news commentator, and businessman.

KARL STEFAN was a resident of Norfolk, Nebr. There he lived a full life, and faithfully served his fine family, his church, his community, his State, and his Nation.

From 1904 to 1906, KARL STEFAN served in the Philippine Constabulary. He served in the Illinois National Guard and later was a lieutenant in the Nebraska National Guard. During World War I, he served his country as a radio code instructor. In World War II, he as a Member of this House not only carried the heavy responsibilities of a Representative but gave effective help in the prosecution of the war, particularly in reference to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. STEFAN was indeed a great citizen, soldier, and statesman, but more than that he was an exemplary husband and father and a Christian gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, to enumerate the contributions that KARL STEFAN has made as a Member of this body would take much time for it is spread on many pages of the RECORD through the years that he served here. He will be remembered for his regular attendance, his detailed knowledge, his clear understanding, and his great ability as a legislator. He was the master of many languages and was a world traveler. These fitted him for the task to which he was assigned. He was a helpful consultant to the Government of the United States in the formation of the United Nations, in the recent Japanese Peace Conference, and on many other occasions. He expressed his love for his country by rendering able and distinguished service for it. Of him can truthfully be said:

Statesman, yet a friend of truth. Of soul sincere,

In action faithful, and in honor clear;
Who broke no promise, served no private ends.

KARL STEFAN is survived by his wife, Mrs. Ida Stefan, and their two children, Dr. Karl Franklin Stefan and Mrs. Ida Mae Askren. To them we extend our deepest sympathy and point them to the words of the Master, "Let not your heart be troubled, ye believe."

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed difficult for me to say the things that I would like to say about our departed friend and colleague, KARL STEFAN. Yesterday the book of life's activities for KARL STEFAN was closed. He passed beyond that veil that holds the answers to many mysteries of life. He has crossed the stage of life and disappeared behind the dark and mysterious curtain of eternal night. Yes, he has set forth to that mysterious land from "whence no traveler returneth."

Yesterday I stood at his bedside. There was a deathless silence filling the room. I could not help but feel that there was someone else in that room. I have had this feeling before because, as a physician, I have frequently been called upon to close the eyelids in death. I have seen people die that I thought should live and I have seen people live whom I surely thought would die. I know someone had them by the hand besides this physician.

The story of KARL STEFAN's life is one of a humble beginning, of hard work which brought him success seldom equaled by other men. He was born in Zbrakov, Bohemia, March 1, 1884. His parents came to this country a year later. They had a humble beginning that could only be found in America. His parents came to escape some of the evils of the Old World.

KARL STEFAN was educated in the public schools of Omaha; attended night school; took a correspondence course; and was an instructor in the Morse and Continental codes. As a young boy he was a messenger for the Western Union Telegraph Co., and he delivered papers to add his bit to the family purse.

As KARL STEFAN grew to manhood he became interested in newspaper work. He was a reporter, city editor, and later became a radio news commentator. He was active in civic life; he was a member of several organizations. He was honored by the Philippine Government for his services with the Scouts.

KARL STEFAN was a great American who actually died in the harness. I guess that is the way he would have wanted it to be. He made a contribution to his State, the Nation, and the world, which was far beyond that of the average individual. He gave of himself unstintingly. He was honest, he had a strong character, and a high moral plane of integrity. You had to know KARL STEFAN to know the man. He was as friendly as a puppy and yet he had steel in his moral backbone that never wavered when he thought he was right.

He was a sincere and tireless worker for the American people. His broad knowledge of international affairs—and he spoke several foreign languages fluently—made him a valuable Member of the Congress and the Appropriations Committee.

He understood thoroughly the American philosophy of government. I am sure his parents, who were immigrants, instilled in their son an understanding of the principles of freedom and the love of God which gave him a fine and strong character.

He was a man with an understanding heart. His mind and character were en-

riched because he got wisdom in the school of hard knocks.

Karl and I had many intimate and confidential discussions not only about small but about the big things of life. It was just last Friday that we had one of those confidential talks. I learned to depend upon him. His counsel and advice were seldom wrong.

Mr. Speaker, a mighty oak of the forest has fallen. A noble soul has gone to his reward. The silver cord is loosened. The golden bowl is broken. The picture has been dashed to pieces. He has left indelible footprints on the sands of time that should serve as a proper marker for those who are to follow.

KARL STEFAN had many friends. It seems that one can truly say that the measure of a man's soul is in his capacity for making friends. He realized that the finest flower growing along the highway of life is that of fellowship and friendship with his fellowman.

KARL STEFAN realized that the greatest business in the world was that of making friends, and no investment on the street paid him larger dividends.

Karl realized that life was a great investment and that no one lived in vain who guards a hundred friendships as a miser guards his gain.

Karl has lived and hoped that no mortgages would ever foreclose his many partnerships of friends.

Mr. Speaker, Nebraska, the Nation, and the world has lost a sincere Christian man. My profound sympathy goes out to his wife and family.

I will miss him very much and hesitate to bid a fond but lasting farewell to a man who was my friend. I think Kipling had someone like Karl in mind when he composed his *When Earth's Last Picture Is Painted*:

When earth's last picture is painted, and the tubes are twisted and dried,
When the oldest colors have faded, and the youngest critic has died,
We shall rest, and faith, we shall need it—
lie down for an aeon or two,
Till the Master of all good workmen shall put us to work anew.

And those that were good shall be happy;
they shall sit in a golden chair;
They shall splash on a 10-league canvas with brushes of comet's hair.
They shall find real saints to draw from—
Magdalene, Peter, and Paul;
They shall work for an age at a sitting and never be tired at all.

And only the Master shall praise us, and only the Master shall blame;
And no one shall work for money, and no one shall work for fame,
But each for the joy of working, and each, in his separate star,
Shall draw the thing as he sees it for the God of things as they are!

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in the sudden passing of KARL STEFAN, Congress and the Nation have lost a wise and steadfast public servant. Nebraska has lost one of its most distinguished citizens. I have lost a valued friend and kind counselor.

KARL STEFAN's career was a story of what can be achieved in America by individual ability and industrious effort.

He had energy and talents that have served the country well during his many years in this House.

His fatherly guidance and heart-warming friendship will be sorely missed by many of us. The memory of his presence and his achievements will serve as an inspiration to Nebraskans for long years to come.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, life with all its thrills and joys is crowded with many sad moments—and no moment is sadder than when we pause to honor the passing of a beloved friend.

Today such a friend has gone, KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska, unexpectedly has received the call all must some day receive.

It is hard to believe Karl is dead. He was with us only a few short days ago. As he chatted with me I could not help but think he looked unusually healthy and appeared to be in excellent spirits. Now he is dead.

Born in Bohemia, coming to Nebraska a babe in his mother's arms, a Western Union messenger, a telegraph operator, a news reporter and editor, radio commentator, soldier in the Philippines, 17 years a Member of Congress, a student of Government finances, and an expert on foreign affairs.

What a career. What a service this Bohemian-born citizen gave to his adopted country—the country he placed first in his loyalty and his allegiance. It is a career that must be an inspiration to every boy—either immigrant or native. It is a career that could not be emulated in any country other than the United States.

KARL STEFAN was a hard worker; his death was unquestionably hastened by the long hours he devoted every day to his congressional career. Speaking six different languages and conversant with every country in the world and with world conditions, his death is a great loss to us in these days of world strife and unrest.

Everyone loved KARL STEFAN. He was a man without an enemy. In my long association with him, his friendship was one I highly prized. I never heard him speak an unkind word of anyone. His was a constructive mind.

We have all lost a real friend, a truly great legislator. Nebraska has been deprived of a fine public servant and America of a patriotic and constructive Congressman.

To his good wife and his family go our deepest sympathy in this hour of bereavement. To all it is comforting to recall that while we will miss his kindly greetings and presence, his good deeds and good work will ever be an inspiration to all of us.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a sad moment for the membership of the House of Representatives to hear officially of the death of our dear and beloved friend and colleague. I

thoroughly agree with the well prepared and well thought out remarks of my colleagues who have preceded me in eulogizing this noble-minded gentleman, this gentleman of noble and lovable character. KARL STEFAN was loved by everyone who knew him. I know of no Member of the House who was more respected and loved by his colleagues than KARL STEFAN, a kindly man, understanding in his associations with his fellow men, a man of real charity, a man who never expressed an unkind thought in the years I have been associated with him in this body, a man of restraint in his views and expressions with reference to others, a man who had as complete control over himself as any human being possibly could have.

I speak not only as JOHN McCORMACK losing a valued friend, but also as majority leader I speak for this side of the House, and I join with my Republican colleagues in expressing to you our deep sorrow in the passing of this great American, and this outstanding member of your party.

As Members of the House, we all join with each other in our kindly feelings, incapable of adequate expression, at the passing of this great man. As Members have said, his life's story is a real story of the Horatio Alger we used to read as youngsters, a stimulating story that brought thoughts of nobility into our minds. He was truly a great man; great, not because he was a Member of Congress, but because he was possessed of those noble attributes which make up a great and good man, a kindly man, and a noble man. No matter where men may live, in my opinion these things make a great man. KARL STEFAN was a great man in his own right in every sense of the word. The fact that he came to Congress and in this arena was able to evidence his greatness to the people of the country proves that fact.

I join with the Members of this House in expressing to his family my great sorrow. I express to my Republican colleagues the sympathy of this side in your great sorrow, and particularly to the Nebraska delegation, more particularly to the people of Nebraska and to the people of this great congressional district that he so ably and effectively represented.

For myself, I express my regret that I have lost not only a dear friend, but a friend whom I sincerely admired and respected.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, fine, sincere words are being spoken in the Chamber of the House of Representatives, a Chamber until recently graced by the presence of a great American, a great father and husband, KARL STEFAN. They are being spoken in memory of Mr. STEFAN by his colleagues; yes, and by his friends who loved him and admired him and respected him.

Sincere words, I said, and so they are. May those of his family and friends not privileged to be present to hear these words spoken, know from us that they are sincere. These words come from

the very bottoms of the hearts of the people here who have worked with KARL STEFAN through the years he served so ably and so honorably as a Member of the House of Representatives. May they take comfort in the knowledge that they are sincere words, words spoken so that everyone may understand how deeply we mourn the loss of our great friend.

It seems but yesterday, that day in 1935, when, with KARL STEFAN, I came here as a fledgling Member of the House of Representatives. Those of us who have served through these troublesome times well understand that even though it seems only a day ago, yet we have seen the constantly increasing burden of problems and difficulties with which we have had to contend. These problems and difficulties become at times so intense as to result, undoubtedly, in the sad situation which sees a man much too young to die sacrificing himself in noble, unselfish service to his country.

I would characterize KARL STEFAN as a man of strong convictions but a man always willing to listen to reason; strong, but always gentle; firm, but not unbending; typifying the highest type of congressional service. KARL STEFAN was a man who became a specialist in that particular field that was assigned to him in the work of the House of Representatives, yet remained always a servant of the people he was privileged and honored to represent, always mindful of the problems peculiar to them, making their attitudes, their needs, and their desires heard in the Hall of the House of Representatives. Finally, I would characterize KARL STEFAN, as not only the able Representative of a great district from the great State of Nebraska, but as Representative of the people of the United States and of the people of the world, for whom he had the utmost love and affection and of whom he had the deepest understanding. It is tragic that he has left this Chamber and his work here. We shall miss him, but may it not well be said that having known him and having been privileged to witness his example each one of us will be a better man or woman, better able to represent our great country in this time of danger and strife?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, KARL STEFAN came on the Appropriations Committee very soon after he became a Member of this House. There, by his industry, faithfulness, sincere strong character, his ability to size up situations and to work them out he became a very valuable Member.

I think KARL STEFAN had about as wide a range of knowledge and understanding as any man whom I have known in this House, and his service was of tremendous value to the people he represented, to the State, and to the country as a whole; and, I might say that perhaps it got beyond that into the world. We are going to miss him; we are going to miss his fine spirit; we are going to miss the things that he could do better than some of the rest of us; but, we must all be

glad, we must all be proud that such a fine character has been with us.

To his family, one of the most devoted I know, I give and extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, one of the many compensations of membership in the House of Representatives is the opportunity to develop personal friendships with the exceptional men and women with whom we are here associated. And one of the inexplicable features of our service here in the House is the suddenness with which that friendship is too often abruptly broken—as it has been broken today in the death of our friend and colleague, KARL STEFAN.

If anyone had asked me yesterday who of all our colleagues was probably the next to be called, KARL STEFAN would have been one of the last brought to my mind. If anyone had asked who of all our colleagues in the House we could least afford to lose, certainly he would have been among the first to be mentioned.

His death removes from the House and from a busy and hard-pressed committee one of its most indispensable members at a critical time in the work of the committee and in the relations of our Government abroad. For his particular section of the committee is directly concerned with international relations and world problems at a time when our Nation has, willingly or unwillingly, been thrust into a position of world leadership. For a decade, either as chairman or as minority ranking member of the subcommittee, he has devoted his great talents to this important work with singular success.

He was especially fitted for this particular work. His calm judicial temperament, his poise, his fluent knowledge of European languages and the historic background of European politics and culture, his deep interest in the current problems not only of our own country but of world humanity, made him one of the most useful members of one of the most responsible subcommittees of the House. Regardless of all considerations of sentiment and affection we can ill afford to lose him in these trying times.

But it is not of his talents, his service, his value to his country that we are thinking this morning. We are thinking today of a friend, of a comrade, of a loved associate who has labored with us through these trying years and who has passed on ahead of us into that undiscovered country from which no word has ever come back to us. And his sudden passing brings back to us again the old question which has been asked in every generation since the beginning of time. You will recall the answer of Ion to that question in the drama of Euripides. As the devoted youth stepped into the garlanded procession on its way to the amphitheater where he was to give up his life as a sacrifice for his country, his companion by his side asked the old, old question: "Shall we meet again?"

And the youth, pausing for an instant's meditation, answered as if by sudden inspiration:

I have asked that dreadful question of the hills that are eternal, of the clear streams that flow forever, of the stars amidst whose azure depths my raised spirits have walked in glory, yet they are dumb. But when I look into thy living, loving face I see that which, mantling through its rich beauty, tells me it can never die.

We shall meet again.

Life is eternal. Love is immortal. Friendship is deathless.

We shall meet again.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I feel a sense of deep personal loss in the passing of our good friend and colleague, KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska. I shall miss him greatly.

Born overseas some 67 years ago, and coming to this country in the first year of his life, he was destined to lead a career that began as a messenger boy for the Western Union and that culminated in 17 years of distinguished service as a Member of the Congress.

His experience in the National Guard, his experience in the Philippine Constabulary, his experience on the various rungs of the ladder in the publishing field, gave him not only many friends in every walk of life but a broad understanding of human nature.

His ability as a linguist, with a capacity to speak fluently a number of languages, his wide travels throughout the principal countries of the world, gave him a grasp of world conditions which was invaluable to him in this day in which we live.

To read his record is to appreciate what a wide, varied, and successful life KARL STEFAN had.

The decorations which he received, the honorary degree of doctor of laws conferred upon him, bear witness to some extent of the appreciation of his success in life.

Mr. Speaker, I knew KARL STEFAN intimately over the years.

I worked with him closely as a member of the Appropriations Committee, to the work of which he contributed so splendidly, particularly as chairman and as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee to which he was assigned, having jurisdiction over appropriations for four of the major divisions of the Federal Government.

Anyone who heard his major speech this year on the bill making appropriations for the State Department, the Department of Justice, the Commerce Department and the Judiciary and who was present at the ovation which he received at its conclusion, will appreciate the grasp which he had in the field in which he had specialized.

I not only worked with him closely in the Congress, I had many good times with him out of Congress. One of the happiest memories I have in this connection is of a trip which we both made to Europe as delegates to a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in 1939, a meeting which terminated just a day or

two before the forces of Hitler marched into Poland.

Mr. Speaker, KARL STEFAN was a man of high character, of great ability, with a real understanding of human nature, and with a temperate and balanced judgment.

It was his privilege to make a great contribution during his lifetime to his State and to the Nation.

We can ill afford to lose him at this difficult time.

I join with all those who have spoken in extending heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Stefan, to the other members of his family and to all those close to him.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, again Old Glory drops to half-mast as a mark of respect to a great American. A dear and beloved colleague has left us. This time it is Hon. KARL STEFAN, one of the ablest Representatives who has served in the House of Representatives in our time.

The public service rendered by our dear colleague will ever be a yardstick by which to measure exceptional and outstanding congressional representation.

Whenever I shall think of Hon. KARL STEFAN and his able and patriotic service to his country I shall recall these words:

That which raises a country, that which strengthens a country, and that which dignifies a country, that which spreads her power, creates her moral influence, and makes her respected and submitted to, bends the hearts of millions, and bows down the pride of nations to her—the instrument of obedience, the fountain of supremacy, the true throne, crown, and scepter of a nation is not an aristocracy of blood, not an aristocracy of fashion, not an aristocracy of talent only; it is an aristocracy of character. This is the true heraldry of man.

Mrs. Reed joins with me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Stefan and her family in this time of their great bereavement.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I am one of those who, on a sad and solemn occasion such as this, cannot command such brilliant language and oratory as we have heard here in this Chamber this afternoon. My heart is too heavy. I simply and humbly say that the State of Nebraska has lost one of its ablest Representatives, this House one of its most respected Members, and our Nation a great American. I have lost an esteemed and close friend. I have had the pleasure and the benefit of serving with KARL STEFAN on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and the Federal Judiciary day by day, week by week, month by month, and year by year for over 6 years. Never in all that time did I hear KARL STEFAN express an unpleasant or unkind word. Yet KARL STEFAN was a man of strength and firmness. KARL STEFAN was a man possessed of great principles, and a man who despised smallness or sham when-

ever he found it. KARL STEFAN was one of the ablest members of the great House Committee on Appropriations. I appreciated then, and do today appreciate the many things I learned from him with regard to the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary. I learned much about civil aviation, and the aviation industry and the State Department from KARL STEFAN, and about such important bureaus as the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in both of which he always expressed such a keen interest. But beyond all this, I had the great pleasure of knowing him intimately outside the halls of Congress. It is only about 3 weeks ago that I attended the Japanese Peace Conference at San Francisco with Karl and his lovely wife, and his son, Dr. Karl Stefan, and daughter-in-law. We had a most pleasant week together. It was only last Thursday evening that Karl, apparently in the best of health, was with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], and some others of us, at a pleasant soiree here in Chevy Chase at the home of Phillips Moore, Director of the Office of Airports of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and we had a very pleasant few hours together. Little did we think on that evening that we would be here today lamenting his passing.

Mr. Speaker, may I conclude by saying that we have all suffered an irreparable loss. I shall miss Karl, but shall treasure forever my friendship and association with him. Mrs. Stefan, his son, and daughter have my deepest sympathy upon their loss of a devoted husband and fine father who has left them the consolation and heritage of a respected name and the exemplary record of many years devoted to public service.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER].

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Speaker, fate has a strange way of doing things. KARL STEFAN and I came to Nebraska the very same year. He came in his mother's arms from Bohemia, and I arrived in the conventional manner in the same State. As I think of the boyhood days that he and I both spent in that State of magnificent distances—why between the little ranch where I was born and Norfolk, there was not an object which would obstruct your vision if your eyes could see that far—I never dreamed that the last several years of his life would be spent in such intimate contact as I have had with KARL STEFAN. You know yesterday, he and I were the only Members of our party on the subcommittee, and during the years of intimate association with Karl I have grown to appreciate him and love him as I love one of my brothers.

No one could be kinder. No one could be stronger nor more inflexible when principle was concerned than KARL STEFAN. It has been said he was a citizen of the world. He was. But he preserved something that most Americans lose when they become citizens of the

world. That is, his first love for his adopted country. A boy who was born in Nebraska never loved that soil a particle more than did the little immigrant boy from Bohemia whose mother carried him there. KARL STEFAN never lost that love of his duty and his respect for this Republic. That cannot be said of many others who have served in this body and in the other body of this Congress. There were no other gods before his God when it came to his reverence for deity. There was no other country ahead of his own adopted country. I have seen him suffer when the Government of Bohemia was destroyed and his friend was killed. I have seen those things that have added to his suffering, because I sat next to him and I have been very, very close to him. Some of you missed a friend. I just do not believe any of you can measure my loneliness this day and this hour, when after we have paid our last respects to KARL STEFAN I will probably have to move over into his chair. There is one thing that I pray, that the spirit that guided KARL STEFAN will guide me and help me through these lonesome hours. I miss him more than anyone can tell.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have known KARL STEFAN longer than any other Member of this House. I knew him long before he came to Congress. I knew his people. I always recognized in him those qualities of nobility, honesty, loyalty, and godliness we all hope to find in real Americans.

I, too, was born in Bohemia, as KARL STEFAN was. Consequently we became very close friends. We lived in the same place here in Washington for many, many years. He was a wonderful soul. He loved to utilize some of the linguistic powers which were his. Every chance he had to try me out to speak, whether it was Bohemian, whether it was German, whether it was Slavic, or other languages of which he had a knowledge, it gave him a great deal of pleasure to do so. I know he enjoyed it. Consequently I learned to admire and to love him, because his views were my views.

Only a few months ago we both broadcast messages to our native land, Bohemia, through the facilities of the Voice of America, in an effort to strengthen the minds and the will of the people behind the iron curtain who are bravely fighting again for freedom and independence. He expressed the wish that some day soon the little country of Czechoslovakia, into which Bohemia was incorporated, that had made such great progress as an independent nation through our efforts following World War I, would again attain that freedom and independence so dear to the hearts of her countrymen. Unfortunately, he did not live long enough to see that wish come true, but I earnestly hope that his wish and his prayer will be fulfilled in the very near future.

It is indeed gratifying and pleasing to me to hear these many kind remarks about KARL STEFAN, the boy that came from Bohemia. There are many others

in that great State of Nebraska who came from the same stock. They have contributed magnificently to the growth and development of his home State of Nebraska and I hope they will continue to love and work for the interests of their adopted country above everything else. And why should they not do so? Where else could KARL STEFAN or myself, or anyone coming from a foreign land attain membership in such a great body as this, legislating in the interest of the greatest Nation in the world, a Nation which I hope will continue to be the greatest, most liberal, and the richest country on the globe.

He will not be with us any more. In him this House loses a great legislator, a great humane gentleman, an outstanding and loyal American.

There is nothing that I can add to the words that have been so splendidly uttered about his past and about his record in this House. I, too, join with my colleagues in expressing to his lovely and devoted wife, to his son, and to his daughter my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of my very good friend, KARL STEFAN, comes as a great shock to me. I sought him out when I first came to Congress almost 10 years ago in that his congressional district in Nebraska adjoined my district in Iowa, only the Missouri River separating us. I knew we would have many interests in common and throughout the years we freely exchanged ideas on matters related to our respective agricultural districts and the common welfare of our people.

KARL STEFAN was a great American. He worked zealously at his job as a Representative. He fought valiantly for the American way of life and our system of free enterprise. Through hard work and devotion to duty he gained a position of prominence in the House of Representatives as a member of the great Committee on Appropriations. He came to be recognized as an authority on all matters pertaining to appropriations for the State Department and the Diplomatic Service. He leaves an empty void which will be hard to fill.

KARL STEFAN loved America. He came to this, his adopted country, with his parents from Bohemia when only 1 year old. He came up the hard way in this great land of opportunity. Beginning as a messenger boy, he successfully became a telegraph operator, news writer, reporter, city editor, and a radio news commentator before being elected to Congress. In these halls he has served with honor and distinction for almost 17 years.

In the passing of KARL STEFAN I have lost a dear friend. I shall miss him very much in the days to come. The House of Representatives has lost one of its most valued Members, the Third Congressional District of Nebraska has lost an able and conscientious Representative, and the State of Nebraska and the Nation have lost a great patriot and citizen.

My deepest sympathy goes out to Mrs. Stefan and members of the family. May

God give them strength and courage in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I attempt to pay a tribute to our devoted friend and to one of the most outstanding Members of this body for more than 20 years. He was brought to the United States when he was 1 year old—he knew but scant information of his native birthplace until he became one of the first citizens of this great Republic. He would have been a great man had he never come to the United States. God endowed him with characteristics which would have been great and important in any intelligent nation.

During his congressional life, in my opinion, no Member of this body ever adhered more intuitively and consistently to the highest standards of conduct. KARL STEFAN was successful in whatever he undertook to accomplish; he had the confidence of his fellow man and those who knew him best did not hesitate to join in matters he advocated and follow him with complacency. He was loyal to his party but never hesitated to disagree with those he conceived to be wrong. He was above reproach in his record and commanded the respect of all even when few were in agreement with him.

His great State, Nebraska, has lost a great citizen who sought always to fulfill the duties assigned to him. This Nation will always be great when Representatives of KARL STEFAN's type fulfill the duties assigned to them.

May God bless and keep his loved ones. I cannot appraise his friendship and I shall cherish his friendship until we meet in that "city which has foundations whose builder and maker is God."

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, it was a great shock when late yesterday I heard of the death of my dear friend, KARL STEFAN. I remember well when he first came to Congress. I was anxious to meet him at that time because his election had been something of a political upset, and I wondered what manner of man he was. And I also wanted to welcome him as one coming from a neighboring State and from a district with problems similar to those of the one which I represent. It was easy to become acquainted with KARL STEFAN. He was a friendly person, and I can readily understand why he was so popular then and since with his Nebraska constituents.

KARL STEFAN had such a sweet, gentle, and lovable personality that it was impossible to be his acquaintance without being his friend. He came to Congress after a wide experience in working with people in all walks of life not only in this country but in other parts of the world. He was a self-made man in the very best sense of the word, and his life could very well be cited as exemplifying the opportunities which exist in America. It is a great success story and should be an inspiration to every boy and girl and young man and young woman in America today.

KARL STEFAN came to Congress at a time when great economic and political problems were confronting this country and the world. He played a conspicuous part in dealing with those problems. I think it is fortunate that during these years we have had a man with the temperament, the ability, and the experience of KARL STEFAN occupying important positions here in the Congress. He was active in many lines, but I am thinking particularly of his work on the Committee on Appropriations, and as chairman and ranking minority member of the subcommittee dealing with appropriations for the State Department. This was a position for which his wide experience, broad outlook, and keen intelligence peculiarly fitted him.

KARL STEFAN was a man with a great heart. He had a genuine love for humanity, and his every thought and action demonstrated this. I feel that the Nation and the Congress have benefited tremendously because of his service, and as an individual I am better for having known him during these years. Although he is gone his work will live on; and much as we shall miss him, all of us who have had the privilege of being associated with him will treasure many happy memories.

To his wife and children I extend my most sincere sympathy and the hope that they will be given the strength to carry their heavy burden.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, KARL STEFAN's passing has brought deep sorrow to all of us. Knowing him has enriched the lives of all of his colleagues in this House.

His was a great and a lovely soul. An immigrant lad, the doors of opportunity opened to him. This is truly a land of opportunity for all, that is why we love this country so.

I shall miss him always, and to his devoted family I offer my very deepest sympathies.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in mourning the passing of KARL STEFAN and in paying tribute to his memory. I had a special affection for him. He and I were in that group of 100 new Members of Congress who were first elected to the House of Representatives in November 1934. KARL STEFAN was a Republican, but I soon learned that he had little time for and little interest in strictly party matters. He was an American in every sense of the word and the welfare of the country was his consuming and paramount interest.

After a time Karl and I were appointed to the House Appropriations Committee and we served together for a period as members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia. KARL STEFAN was a great friend of the people of the District of Columbia

and he deserves the praise of the people of the District for his fine and unselfish service in matters involving the District.

KARL STEFAN was a statesman. He served well, and with unceasing industry, the people of his home district in Nebraska. But his interests were worldwide. He was greatly interested in the cause of world understanding and peace. He had traveled widely in Asia and Europe. He had a grasp of world conditions which marked him as a leader in this field in the Congress.

KARL STEFAN was much beloved for his fine personal qualities. He was gentle and kind. He was thoughtful and tolerant. He was friendly and of an understanding nature. He was a good companion. I join with my colleagues in expressing deepest sympathy to Mrs. Stefan and their two children.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep personal regret and sorrow that I learn of the passing from our midst of our honored and respected colleague, KARL STEFAN.

KARL STEFAN, was a man of strong convictions. His sincerity of purpose was recognized by all who have served with him in the House of Representatives. At no time, was he willing to compromise his allegiance to any cause where a fundamental principle was involved. He was careful to ascertain all pertinent facts that had a bearing upon any subject before the Congress. His opinion upon matters of legislation was respected for the reason that his decision was always the result of studied judgment. It was based upon facts. Once his mind was made up he followed the course his judgment dictated to the end. The great influence he exerted in the House was due to the knowledge upon the part of the Members that he was well informed on the facts of the issue under consideration, and was sincere in the conclusions he reached. His service to the country, his State, and the Third Congressional District of Nebraska has been able, sincere, and distinguished.

It is also appropriate to make reference to the deep love he had for this country, its free institutions and its people. His patriotism was of a high order. It was a part of his heart and soul.

Throughout the years that our colleague has served with us we have observed the close and happy relationship that has existed between Karl and his good wife. We can readily understand the deep sense of loss she feels in the sudden passing away of her faithful and considerate husband. We extend to her and other members of the family our deep and sincere sympathy.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to express in words my feelings about KARL STEFAN which, perhaps, is due to the suddenness of his death that has shocked us all, and also because I have always felt that his was a character somewhat set apart from the rest of us. I do not mean by this that he was aloof from his colleagues, because he was a most approachable and thoughtful person, but his nobility of character created a feeling that made him different from others. I have seldom known a man with more intense feelings and convictions, backed by a

matchless courage. He was an inspiration to all who knew him.

Although not a native-born American, he brought to our citizenry a tremendous desire to be of service to the cause of freedom and he continually resented any encroachments which might abridge the free rights of any citizen. His long record of public service and active participation in many activities having to do with the promotion of civil liberty and constitutional rights made him honored, respected, and beloved by a host of men and women who will miss his counsel and his kind heart.

KARL STEFAN was the type of American that we need more of in these days for by his example of Christian service and devotion to high ideals, all who knew him recognized him as a leader and honored him as a friend.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the first Members of the House of Representatives I had the pleasure of meeting in 1945, when I first came to Congress, was the Honorable KARL STEFAN. That friendship existed between us since that time. It was my privilege to serve on the Appropriations Committee of the House with Congressman STEFAN, and I had the opportunity to observe his ability and integrity, his sincere attitude toward his duties and his Government. Mrs. Hedrick and I had the good fortune to live in the adjoining apartment to Congressman and Mrs. Stefan at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington for about 4 years. I can truthfully say that I have never known a more neighborly or a more cooperative individual in my whole life. He was an excellent neighbor.

It was a great shock to me, as well as to all the Members of the House of Representatives, especially the members of the Appropriations Committee who knew him so well, to learn of the illness and death of this distinguished American. It is extremely unfortunate that our country has to lose the knowledge and ability of this gentleman in these trying times. The State of Nebraska has lost an able Representative; the Nation has lost a real statesman.

I join with all the other Members of the House in extending sincere sympathy to the family, especially to Mrs. Stefan who was so close and who cooperated so beautifully with her husband.

HON. KARL STEFAN, PATRIOT AND STATESMAN

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives cannot afford to lose men like KARL STEFAN. His outstanding service in this House is known to every Member. His passing is a personal loss to me. Just last week he came to me with a statement of his impression as to events at the San Francisco Peace Conference. He carefully read each line to me, and I told him that it was an excellent statement; in fact, it is the best I have seen. It appears in the RECORD for last Thursday.

At the San Francisco Conference it was the happy privilege of Mrs. Smith and myself to see Karl and his wife, his son, Dr. Karl Stefan, Jr., and his wife quite often. They were constantly interested in our welfare, and we shall never forget the many courtesies they extended to us. The devotion of KARL

STEFAN to his fine wife and family will always remain a pleasant memory to us.

Mr. Speaker, KARL STEFAN was a self-made man. As a young man he worked his way to prominence in the field of communications, starting at the bottom. He often spoke of his trips from Chicago to Racine, my own city, on excursion boats that plied between the two cities. Later he turned to newspaper work and then to radio, and subsequently he was elected to this distinguished body. Honest, hard work brought KARL STEFAN to the top in his chosen work.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Committee it was his responsibility to pass upon State Department appropriations. He became an expert in this field. I often talked with him about the Department's requests, and very patiently he would acquaint me with all of the details.

Mr. Speaker, KARL STEFAN expressed great concern about our global spending and our present foreign policies. Yet he staunchly defended the Department in its basic policies. On the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1951 KARL STEFAN made one of the best statements that was made in the course of that debate. His knowledge of the State Department was evident in that speech.

KARL STEFAN was a kindly and considerate soul. He had no enemies in this House, and he was loved by his colleagues who worked with him on his subcommittee. He was particularly fond of the gentleman from New York [JOHN ROONEY]. These two men never permitted partisan politics to mar their personal friendship.

Mr. Speaker, here was a man, a patriot, and a statesman. This country could ill afford to lose him at this time. All of us shall miss him. My deep sympathy to his fine wife, Mrs. Stefan, and to his family.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the many words spoken in tribute to KARL STEFAN were an attempt to portray a really great character, but in my opinion the English language does not contain words which would adequately express the nobleness and the gentleness of our colleague who passed away so suddenly.

I have a deep feeling of grief and personal loss, as I considered him as one of the best friends I had in the House. From the first days of my service here, he immediately appealed to me as a man of great breadth of vision and wisdom, and I am sure that he impressed everyone with whom he came in contact with his tolerance and kindness.

His life was a shining example to every Member serving in this body now, and will also be a shining example to those who will hereafter serve in this body; and I say this because there are so many times when grave differences of opinion and judgment make it quite difficult to maintain a real spirit of tolerance for the views and opinions of those with whom we differ.

His services in the cause of the people of his district, of his State, and of the Nation, will be sorely missed.

As was said by one of the previous speakers, no man of nobler stature will ever in the future serve in these Halls,

and there will be but few in the future of equal stature who will serve. May all of us keep his memory fresh in our minds, and endeavor to the best of our talents to emulate him.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I received a distinct shock when I learned of the death of KARL STEFAN. During the past 5 years I had come to know and admire Mr. STEFAN. He was a true gentleman in every sense of the word. He and I became fast friends and on the last day in which he sat in the House we talked about a contemplated trip we were proposing to make to Latin America.

His life should be an inspiration to young Americans. His record is a typical American success story. He was born in Bohemia and came to America as a child. He worked at all kinds of jobs while climbing the ladder of success. Mr. STEFAN was a great linguist, speaking six languages. He was familiar with many parts of the world, having traveled widely, both before and after becoming a Member of the House of Representatives.

KARL STEFAN was a tolerant man. He was wise enough to know that the viewpoints on the great public problems facing our country, do not stand out in bold relief in black or white. There is a great twilight area and while he had firm convictions and took his stand courageously on the problems which Congress must consider, he had no rancor or hatred for those who differed with him.

He was a great admirer and supporter of the foreign service. This attitude was developed by extensive study and much travel to all parts of the world, visiting foreign service offices and talking with the personnel in them. KARL STEFAN took a broad dispassionate view of our grave national problems. In his approach to the solution of our perplexing problems of the troubled world of today, Mr. STEFAN exhibited the traits of a statesman. He considered them on the basis of how can these proposed solutions solve the problems before us, rather than from the standpoint of who is sponsoring them or how will they effect the fortunes of any political party. We hope that God will send us more men of the Stefan type.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the death of KARL STEFAN came as a great shock to me. He was a real friend and we members of the Appropriations Committee particularly will miss our close association with him. Our country has lost one of its finest legislators. He was a true American and a great patriot. KARL STEFAN and I had many common interests and the similarity of the problems in our districts brought us together often for conference where I profited by his keen understanding and sage advice.

I join my colleagues in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Stefan and their children.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the large number of Members who have spoken so eloquently today in tribute to our colleague, KARL STEFAN, testifies to the high esteem and deep affection in which he was held by every Member of this House.

The Congress has never had a man who fought with greater courage and

resolution for the things in which he believed than KARL STEFAN. Yet, there was in him a kindness and understanding that won the hearts even of those who disagreed with him on some particular piece of legislation. No one ever doubted KARL STEFAN's sincerity. Everyone respected his ability. All loved him for his personal attributes.

We, his colleagues, who have been in daily associations with him over many years, all, unanimously, acclaimed his ability and his character. There could be no finer tribute to any man than that so many who knew him so intimately over so many years should be so unanimous in speaking so earnestly of his fine qualities of statesmanship and of personality.

KARL STEFAN loved the House of Representatives and the House of Representatives loved him. His name always will be enshrined high on the list of those who, as lawmakers, have served their country with fearlessness and fidelity.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, KARL STEFAN is dead. It does not seem that it can be so. It seems that as the years go by "the milestones into headstones change, 'neath every one a friend". So recently, I have lost two very dear friends, in Congressman Frank Fellows, of Maine, and now KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska.

To those protagonists who seek to change our form of government from what it is to something else, KARL STEFAN's life and accomplishments are the greatest answer. Karl was born in Bohemia. Obviously he had to earn his education, and he began his career as a messenger boy for the Western Union and worked his way up from there. He had a tremendous background in everyday life, and that experience became invaluable to him as a Member of Congress. Whatever his work was, he was obtaining knowledge constantly. The problems of the people of every walk of life were his problems. He thought, he lived, and he legislated that way.

KARL STEFAN made friends wherever he was. He was an invaluable Member of the House because of his ability and his industry and his rich background of experience.

With all the burdens imposed upon him as one of the ranking members of the Appropriations Committee and the constant demands that were made upon him, he was always anxious and willing to be of help to his colleagues who had problems which Karl could be helpful in solving. I am personally indebted to him for his kindness to me in this regard.

Not only am I indebted to him, but so are others in this country by reason of his great heart and helpfulness. KARL STEFAN was indeed a sweet, kindly Christian gentleman. That did not mean that he was not firm in his judgments and convictions, but in his firmness he was never bitter. As an immigrant boy he knew and loved this country. He put the interest of the United States above all else.

With his gentleness and his understanding, he was a wonderful husband. My deepest sympathy goes to his beloved

wife and his family in their hour of great sadness.

My sympathy also goes to the great State of Nebraska, and particularly to those of his congressional district. With all due respect to whomever his successor may be, no one could exceed **KARL STEFAN** as their Representative.

The beautiful tributes that have been paid to Karl are richly deserved. It is but a recognition of his ability, his industry, his patriotism, and his character, and we of this House are poorer indeed to have lost this good and fine man, able legislator, and intense patriot.

Reverently I say, "Eternal rest grant unto him, O Lord."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I shall always remember **KARL STEFAN** for his great love of country, his constant anxiety for world peace, his inimitable way of putting his thoughts right on the line, and his friendliness to others, particularly his colleagues in the Congress. He was especially kind to me, dating back to those days when I was a congressional secretary privileged to pal with his efficient aide, Ray Nedrow, who stood by his chief through thick and thin these last 18 years.

Occasionally, back home in my district, it has been my privilege to address groups of those from foreign lands just acquiring the rights of American citizenship. It was always a delight to feature the Horatio Alger story of **KARL STEFAN** who came to America's shores from Bohemia when he was just 1 year old, began work as a messenger boy, became a newspaper editor, served as a Philippines volunteer, was elected to Congress and acted as sort of a one-man Voice of America during World Wars I and II. I doubt that Ray Nedrow knows the number of languages his chief could speak.

The two last speeches made by **KARL STEFAN** still ring in my ears—one a plea that we correct immediately the mistake made by our Government in not commemorating properly on grave markers the services of our dead in Korea and the other a warning to the Czech Government that it be sensible and release Bill Oatis, of the Associated Press, from his prison cell.

KARL STEFAN gave his all to his congressional assignment and everyone on the House Appropriations Committee knew that he was our No. 1 authority on funds required by the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments.

Early this year our colleague suffered from an attack of pneumonia. It was during the hearings being held by his subcommittee and he refused to stay at home, relax, and build up. When he came back on December 19 from his services as a congressional observer at the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty at San Francisco he sat alongside of me in the House and asked if I had realized any rest during the House recess. When I told him I had enjoyed 10 days away from the grind he said that he regretted he had not done likewise. "I feel the need of such," he repeated.

I think today of **KARL STEFAN**'s widow, his son and his daughter. I wish I had been privileged to know them. While my heart goes out to them, I am sure that

they will derive some comfort from the heartfelt tributes being uttered on the House floor today by so many colleagues that knew and loved him who has been called away. And I think of Secretary Ray Nedrow who felt his chief had no peer. His life has been changed so suddenly. I hope I shall be able to express myself adequately when I next see him.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, my heart is heavy today, for the loss of our friend, the gentleman from Nebraska, brings genuine and lasting sorrow to every Member of the House. On these occasions when we offer our tributes to departed colleagues, memories of past associations are revived and the most recent of them flash before us. I recall, for example, the words of **KARL STEFAN** in our last conversation. As I left him, he turned with a smile and said, "Brooks, you really believe, don't you, that your friend Lum is secure?" That question had no significance to anyone else, and I understood it only because of an earlier conversation we had had with other Members in one of the informal talks that mean so much in the building of friendships here.

We were speaking of our favorite hymns, and he was interested in the fact that one of my favorites is *The Ninety and Nine*. I would like to share this with the House today because of **KARL STEFAN**'s special interest in the story which explained my preference. As a boy I held in deepest respect and admiration a man of our community whose theological views were held by some to be somewhat unorthodox, and it created fears as to this neighbor's destiny. It concerned me as a boy because, with my interest in matters of religious faith, I decided I did not want to go to heaven unless my friend, whom I called Mr. Lum, were going too. I told **KARL STEFAN** how my anxieties were soothed by an intelligent young minister who explained to me without doing violence to theological principles that Mr. Lum was going to be saved. After I was sure that this good man had been brought into the fold I identified my feeling of relief with the song they often sang in the little congregation that I knew and loved as a boy. That song was *The Ninety and Nine*, for as it reached the climax of the interesting little drama the shepherd said, "I have found my sheep." For me, that recovered sheep was the one who had been left out of the community's calculations, Mr. Lum.

All who knew **KARL STEFAN** will understand my meaning in making reference to this simple little story and his particular delight in sharing my reactions. He was interested in the Good Shepherd's quest. His occasional pleasantry, "Do you think Lum was saved?" touched deep sentiments.

Mr. Speaker, if I am sure of any man's eternal destiny, I am sure about the gentleman from Nebraska. He was indeed a man of faith. In notable ways he was also a man of good deeds. We knew the warmth of his friendship and the kindness that only a man with a heart and soul as large as his could exhibit. He leaves an influence in the Congress of the United States that will be felt per-

ceptibly long after our legislative careers are closed.

Green be the turf above thee,
Friend of my better days;
None knew thee but to love thee,
None named thee but to praise.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep personal loss that I have had the word of the death of **KARL STEFAN**, whom I have come to cherish not only as a distinguished Member of this House, but also as a fine Christian gentleman.

His calmness in debate and his dedication to sound principles of government have marked him as a great public servant, and certainly the country can ill afford to lose his services at a time when demagoguery all too often passes for statesmanship.

Coursing through the veins of our late colleague was the blood of fighting Czech patriots, and it was from them that he brought to the American scene that great love of liberty which continues to motivate the Czech people at a time when they are feeling the heel of the Communist oppressor. And no one will deny that the cause of freedom throughout the world has never had an abler champion than was found in **KARL STEFAN**.

As we mourn the loss of this God-fearing brother, let us raise our prayers in behalf of those bereaved ones who have been so grievously touched by his going away. May an all-wise Providence ease for them the pain of this parting, and may they take consolation in the memorial to him which will ever remain in the hearts of all who knew him and appreciated his worth as a stalwart apostle of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the death this week of one of our most distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives has deprived the American people of an outstanding legislator whose long service was always marked by faithful attention to the needs of his district and the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Congressman **KARL STEFAN** was one of the many outstanding Americans of Czech ancestry who has made a lasting contribution to our Republic. That he remained busily engaged with his many official tasks until the very end of his life was only what those who knew him would expect.

He was born in Bohemia 67 years ago and came to this country with his parents when only 1 year old. He acquired the habit of hard work in early boyhood, and it continued to be his guiding principle throughout a long and active career both in Congress and in private life. He managed to combine the administrative ability of the successful business executive with the far-seeing legislative vision of a conscientious public servant. It was typical of his concept of citizenship that he served his country voluntarily as a member of the National Guard in the troubled times that followed the Spanish-American War. He was the type of man who shouldered civic burdens cheerfully and who never asked another to perform what he himself saw as his own duty.

In 18 years of service with the House of Representatives he had shown himself capable of statesmanlike vision whose results were always based on honest analysis of every problem and hard work in its solution. He leaves to his devoted wife and to his son and daughter a high heritage that should be of lasting comfort in their hour of grief.

It was not my privilege to be one of KARL STEFAN's intimate associates, but from my contacts with him and my observation of the man and his work I am proud to have had the opportunity of being one of his colleagues in the Congress of the United States. I join all those others here today in their sense of loss.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it was just 24 hours ago that in this very spot I brought to the attention of the House that my very dear friend and my neighbor here in Washington for these many years was seriously ill. I reached my office and was only there a few minutes when word came that he had passed on.

You have heard here today eloquent and glowing tributes paid by the Representatives of the great people of this great Nation; tributes that painted word pictures of KARL STEFAN that his family and friends back home and future generations will love and cherish.

These were great men who spoke here today, distinguished Americans, high in the councils of their own States and of these hallowed Chambers.

Let me tell you, however, of the tribute that I saw yesterday and last night. Since KARL STEFAN has been in town he has had an apartment at the Mayflower Hotel. Since I have been here my apartment has been near his. While entering that building I saw the bell boys, the two elevator operators in the apartment section, the two girls on the desks, all of them with tears, all of them asking me what had happened, and last night the two colored girls on that floor, both of them crying to know that STEFAN was gone. That is the kind of tribute and that is the kind of feeling that you distinguished Members have been giving voice to here today, but if there was any doubt in your hearts that what you heard was true, I bring you these sentiments from these little people who knew STEFAN to be one of them.

I represent a district where there are dozens of thousands of people of the Latin and the Slav races. I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that this entire ceremony, all these words, can be placed on the Voice of America tonight, because in the well of this House you have heard, sir, the true voice of America pouring out its love, its regard, its admiration, its star of faith, of hope, and of charity, to all those everywhere who see in that star what America has been to the world, what America will always mean to the poor, the suffering, and the down-trodden, the peasants, the little people.

We have had a lot of good times together. You would not think of STEFAN as a humorist or a great storyteller, would you? Let me tell you who think you are professional humorists and who

pride yourselves here and off the floor on your storytelling, that you could not hold a candle to him, I know.

Yes, he had several languages. He served in the Philippines. His Spanish was not so good. We used to call it "bamboo Spanish." He learned it as a telegrapher with the Philippine Scouts.

There was not a time, Mr. Speaker, when I passed up this aisle in a division of this House as he would sit back there where generally my distinguished colleagues from Pennsylvania on the Republican side sit, and they are still there now, and as I have walked up that aisle I would say to him, "Cómo está usted, Teniente?" He was a lieutenant in the Philippine Constabulary. He would garble at me some of the most outrageous Spanish you ever heard. But he liked that. He liked friendliness and good fellowship, and he had it in this House.

Mr. Speaker, to go much further with my tribute would be to gild this lily that you have presented to his memory today. Let me say that you heard words from as diversified a group, as different in personality, background, and outlook, the members of this subcommittee of the great Committee on Appropriations, as you would ever gather in the history of this House. ROONEY, of New York; ROONEY, of Brooklyn, I should say, smart, tough, eager scrapper from the sidewalks of New York—and his heart in his throat when he paid a tribute to this man who sat alongside him year after year, and who taught him and me and all of us the ins and outs of the labyrinth of the budgets of these great Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce. I never admired and respected good, old CLEVELAND, of Ohio, more than when we listened to him today, from the wide plains of the farming West, broken, sad, crying—tears that men cry when a friend has gone. You hear my words now from the mountains and coal mines of Pennsylvania. I see before me the distinguished gentleman from Georgia—south of the border—STEFAN would like that. You will hear his tribute to Karl from the cotton fields of the South. You cannot sit in a subcommittee like that down in the salt mines, in the basement of this Capitol, in that little room where we sit day after day, month after month, and year after year, without knowing each other. This is the test of fire. And here we are, our sympathies pouring out, and you will never hear more sincerity, we loved the man. Mrs. Flood joins me in sympathy for his beloved wife and family.

The great and sovereign State of Nebraska, Mr. Speaker, has sent many distinguished sons to this historic Chamber, but she will never send one who will exceed, and she will send very, very few who can equal the loyalty, the hard work, the determination, and the patriotism of her distinguished son whom we now return to her soil, the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. STEFAN.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we are met here at a moment of deep sorrow because there has gone from our midst

a man whom we love—gone so unexpectedly and so suddenly. I am reminded that the deeper sorrow carves into your being, the more joy you can contain.

Karl and his beloved wife, his adored wife, who devoted herself to him in ways that only those who knew them intimately know, came many times to my home for music and such conversation as develops when the heart is tuned by music to broader, deeper, higher vision and understanding.

I would like to read to you what Karl and I read together one night. We had been talking about life and death, wondering about it as all humans do:

You would know the secret of death?
But how shall you find it unless you seek it in the heart of life?

If you would indeed behold the spirit of death, open your heart wide unto the body of life.

I ask you: Was there anyone who did that more truly than KARL STEFAN?

For life and death are one, even as the river and the sea are one.

And like seeds dreaming beneath the snow, your heart dreams of spring.

Trust the dreams, for in them is hidden the gate to eternity.

For what is it to die but to stand naked in the wind and to melt into the sun?

And what is it to cease breathing but to free the breath from its restless tides, that it may rise and expand and seek God unencumbered?

Only when you drink from the river of silence shall you indeed sing.

And when you have reached the mountain top, then you shall begin to climb.

And when the earth shall claim your limbs, then shall you truly dance.

We spoke of those things, and we spoke of a very ancient word in regard to death.

First must each several element
That joined to form the living frame
Flit to the region whence it came
And with its parent source be blent.
Thine eyes shall see the solar orb,
Thy life-breath to the wind shall fly,
Thy part eternal to the sky,
Thine earthly part shall earth absorb.

Music and KARL STEFAN; life and death; they are all close to us all. I think there is no bond closer than the bond of this House. What affects one touches all. Today we are close to each other as we join in sending to his family our love and our deep understanding of their loneliness.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, if the untimely death of KARL STEFAN leads our people, young and old, to read his life story, and to ponder the things that have been said about him today in this House, then he will have made, in his sudden passing and its dramatization of his life and career, one of the greatest of the many contributions he has made to his country during the years of his extraordinary service.

We are living in a time when so much doubt is being cast in many quarters on the integrity or industry or character or ability or usefulness of men in public office, and particularly in elective office. It would be worth so much to our people

and their confidence in their Government and in the possibilities for advancement and noble service in this free Republic to consider what has been accomplished by this man, who in many ways was so plain and simple and in no way a spectacular star, but who used to the full his God-given capacities and the opportunities and privileges offered by his beloved country.

KARL STEFAN was for some years my Congressman. Perhaps I am the only Member of the House who can say that, for until we moved to Minnesota in 1941 I retained, during the years we were abroad, our residence in my home town in Nebraska in the district he represented so long and faithfully. He was a good friend of my father. When I was a boy the Swedes moved in on the west of our strip of township, and the Bohemians moved in on the east. At first a good many of the old settlers sort of felt they were being crowded, and there was some opposition at times on the part of some of the old-timers to the newcomers, especially to the Bohemians. But they got jobs as hired hands, worked long and hard, saved their money, soon were buying land themselves and became as much a part of the country as the first homesteader. When I came home from abroad in the late 1930's, I remember asking my father, "Who is our Congressman now?" He told me KARL STEFAN, and said he thought Karl looked after things better than any Congressman we had had in the 60 years he had lived there. He said, "He is a good Bohemian," which was a tribute to Karl and to the people of his ancestry. My father appreciated the fact that Karl always stopped to see him in that little wide place in the road, and especially after I had come to Congress, too.

So when I first came here in 1941, knowing of his friendship with my father, I sought him out. I soon learned that he had, as almost every Member here today has testified, a unique capacity for friendship. No matter how great the variance in our personalities or interests or backgrounds of education, KARL STEFAN had a special chamber in his heart for each. He revealed to each the special facet that was suited to the special characteristics of the individual in question. He was always interested in the Far East and gave wise counsel and support to me in the point of view regarding its importance to ourselves which I have tried to get adopted. So our friendship ripened and deepened, and I join all here in inability to express adequately our sadness over the loss to our country and to ourselves of this truly great and good man.

I must say another word. Years ago I heard Dr. Will Mayo discussing with a group of young doctors the qualities necessary for a good surgeon. We were aspiring to that profession and most of us, like the general public, were inclined to think that great surgery depended mostly on skill with the hands. That is the way the magazine articles generally portray it, Dr. Will said, "We have trained thousands of doctors in the clinic; one-quarter of all the graduates from medical schools in the coun-

try apply here each year, so we can take our choice. On the basis of our experience we rate the essentials in this order and these are the things we look for in our applicants. The first requirement for becoming a good surgeon is character. The second is industry. The third is a certain amount of native ability. And the fourth, manual dexterity. Surely those first three apply to greatness in any field. KARL STEFAN exemplified them. First of all, character; that is the thing we loved and respected most in him. He never failed anybody. It shone out in his patriotism. I do not think any man in America can love this country more than he did. At the same time he had so large a place in his heart for other countries. He never forgot his birthplace, Czechoslovakia. He never forgot the Philippines. Many of you know how he worked to help them in their difficulties. He never forgot the people of any of a dozen countries where he had lived or traveled or for whose freedom and welfare he had worked. He loved America not less because he loved them, and he loved them not less because he was so unswervingly, undividedly loyal to this country.

What an inspiration to all in his devotion to country and duty.

What a lesson for our youth in his industry, the indefatigable capacity to labor day after day with hard, dry, complicated figures and details until he knew and could tell you anything you wanted to know about any of the agencies for whose affairs he had responsibility.

Nobody was more determined for example to eliminate those elements, in the State Department which had brought disloyalty or discredit to it in some respect; and nobody fought more fiercely and tenaciously against any attempts to weaken it or destroy the Foreign Service because of the misbehavior, incompetence, or other unsuitability of some of its members.

The balance of the man. The steadiness. The quiet friendliness of the genuine, not the glad-handedness of the professional. Nobody ever heard him raise his voice, and yet he made such an imprint on everything he touched through sheer character and industry, and the wide variety of knowledge and talents which he had developed. How kindly and gentle along with his rock-like firmness. How mature and truly civilized a human being.

I cannot add anything to what has been said by so many. I merely want to join in extending my sympathy and affectionate regards to his family. He was out in San Francisco last month with his beloved wife and his son, a doctor. How often he had talked to me with such great pride about that doctor son. How rich will be their memories, as are ours. We love our country more and will be able to serve her better because of men like KARL STEFAN.

MR. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

MR. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine sadness that I say a few words about KARL STEFAN. I knew him when he

first came to this Chamber some 17 years ago. I learned to have an affectionate regard for him. We know of his kindness, his humility, his keen sense of justice. And now, alas, he is in the iron grasp of sleep.

In this life we are prone to worry; the days come and they go; we watch them pass sometimes with happiness, sometimes with sadness, and then we are concerned for tomorrow; we query, "What will the morrow bring forth?" But Karl need no longer worry or be concerned for the morrow, for death keeps no calendar, has no almanac.

Karl and I had several things in common; we both loved music; he played the violin and I, too, have played tolerably well that instrument; and oftentimes in the hotel we spent evenings together in discussions of music; we would discuss the music of the spheres and the music of human values. He often said that he loved the violin above any other instrument, for its tones were more like the human voice than any other instrument; that it was far more preeminent than the instruments of percussion, or the woods, or the brasses. He often said, and I wholly agreed with him, that there was a profundity of softness and kindness as well as sadness and sweetness in the tones of the violin. I am sure that if we try to search for the reasons of the understanding heart of KARL STEFAN, if we try to fathom why he knew the soft, sad music of humanity we might well find that it was a bit because of his knowledge of the harmony of the violin and his intimacy with music. We often discussed together the songs and dances of his native Bohemia, and it was very instructive and refreshing to hear his views.

It is well to say that if death did not exist it would be necessary to invent it. We cannot live forever; the end must come. But it always comes so suddenly, it always comes too soon. So it is with KARL STEFAN; his death has come too soon.

The event of the funeral of Browning caused a poet to utter the following, which we might say on the occasion of Karl's death:

Be not afraid, ye waiting hearts that weep,
For God still "giveth his beloved sleep,"
And if an endless sleep He wills, so best.

Karl's death, I am sure you will agree, is an awful mystery, but I can hear Karl saying at the end, "Good-by my friends, good-by my colleagues, good-by to all; it is God's will."

MR. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

MR. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, when news came to me yesterday that KARL STEFAN had passed on, I was profoundly shocked. It was only last Friday that I met Karl over at the House radio recording facility. We talked for some time. We reminisced about several years ago when I spent several days in his district meeting many of his constituents. We talked about mutual friends. I know from having been in his district that his constituents and his people loved, admired, and respected

him as much as did any Member of this House.

He seemed on that occasion last Friday to be in excellent spirits and buoyant health. Later in the evening of the same day I attended a Civil Aeronautics dinner at the Mayflower along with several of my colleagues from the House. As we walked down the corridor of the hotel we met Karl. He was in tuxedo. We were not. He was going our way. So we became concerned because we thought maybe we had misunderstood the invitation. We asked him about this and he said: "No. You are dressed properly where you are going. I dress this way every evening I dine with my family."

I have thought of that many times since, that mark of respect to his wife and his family. Somehow it tells us of the character of KARL STEFAN.

You know he represented that great neighboring State to the west of Iowa. His loss will be severely felt by the people of his district, his State, and the Nation, but his loss is also Iowa's loss. He was our friend. Those of us who knew him loved him.

You know, there was something about Karl that you could not forget. He was one of those rare individuals that the first time you met him you had the feeling you had known him always. He had that something about his personality which made you feel that he was your friend and always had been your friend from the moment you first met him. He could not have been that way had he not had in his heart that warmth of feeling for his fellow man that only those can have who give out the same feeling when they meet one another.

My heart goes out to his wife and family as well as to the members of his loyal office force so deeply devoted to him.

Yes, we all feel his loss deeply. His body is gone, Mr. Speaker, but his ideals, his memory and all that he stood for, which means so much to each and every one of us, will be with us always.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, we pay a high tribute today to a great American. I think it is entirely fitting and proper that we do so and that we should keep the memory of that individual bright because in so doing we may give some measure of comfort, some measure of solace perhaps to those in his family, his wife, Mrs. Stefan, his son, Dr. Karl Stefan, who is a resident of the State of Washington, and his daughter.

But I am thinking particularly of something that KARL STEFAN, a native of Bohemia, left to me as one who had served on a subcommittee with him.

I have already heard my colleague from New York [Mr. ROONEY], my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], and my colleague from Ohio [Mr. CLEVELANDER], and I see here my colleague from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], and my colleague from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], and many others in this body who have had the privilege of serving on a subcommittee of which KARL STEFAN was the bone and sinew.

He was a foreigner by birth, yet he meant a tremendous amount to the American way of life and to the spirit and the mechanisms of our Republic. We sit here as legislators and adopt policies and enact statutes, which we expect to be administered. Every year those American policies come before the appropriate subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations for review. Down through the years, for the last 10 years, at least, of our most troublous times in this world, with questions hanging fire all over the globe, the policies developing day by day, the one person in this Congress who probably held it together more than any other was KARL STEFAN.

It is indeed heart-warming to me to see those of us who have had the privilege of serving with him on such an important subcommittee on appropriations rise here and speak as we have. It shows to me, at least, that this American system of ours will work if we have the right men in the right places. KARL STEFAN was such a man.

So today I grieve with his family, with the people of the State of Nebraska, and with the citizens of this Republic; and since the citizens of this Republic and their way of Government mean something to the world, I grieve with all those to whom America is a bright light. But in grieving, I am happy that he lived and that his influence was felt among us. I hold that his example means something to those who would appreciate the greatness of this Nation.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, KARL STEFAN and I came to Congress together. By the natural processes of the House our lots were cast together. We went on the Appropriations Committee about a year after coming here, in 1935 and served together for about 10 years. We learned together the things that have been spoken about here so ably in connection with his knowledge of affairs. We often sat together and in a hard way studied the many problems of the Departments of State, Commerce and Justice, and the Federal Judiciary, the Bureau of Prisons, the FBI, later the United Nations, and earlier the Department of Labor and the Department of Social Security when that agency was born.

I could not help but think yesterday of the intimacy of our lot when I heard the sad news of his death. Truly, those words came to me that we so often hear but so seldom take the full significance of, "I will come like a thief in the night."

He was just snatched from life to give an account of his stewardship, for now he will be a steward no longer. KARL STEFAN died in the harness, died with his boots on, died devoted to the country that he loved and the people that he served. Many beautiful things have been said about him here today, for many have spoken of the friendships in the House. But to those who knew him as intimately as I did, the splendid friendship between his wife, Ida, and himself was something to marvel at. If he so endeared himself to us, no one could help but appreciate

her grief at his sudden passing. With those who have spoken before me, I extend to his son, his daughter, and his dear wife, the condolences that every Member of this House feels on this sad occasion. I shall not forget him in my prayers. I shall pray for the repose of his soul, and I hope that the God of all wisdom and all charity will send the soothing graces of consolation to his family.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I was at my home in Georgia yesterday when my office telephoned to advise me of KARL STEFAN's passing. The news came to me with a shocking impact for it had been only on Thursday of last week that I had sought him out on the floor of the House and had asked his consent that I might be allowed to give my proxy to my committee chairman in order that I might go home for the week end and Monday and Tuesday of this week. Karl, in his usual gracious manner, said "Of course, you must go home. Take advantage of every opportunity to go home. How I wish I could go home, too." Had Karl gone home on last Thursday, he probably would have died at home where, I am sure, he would have wanted to spend his last moments.

A few months ago, I made the observation at the annual memorial services which we hold for our departed colleagues that generations develop their own peculiar customs, and that one of them is to wait until after death takes our friends from our midst to express our thoughts about their lives and to pay tribute to them. I sometimes wonder if that is not a very bad custom, for I know that KARL STEFAN would be happy today if in life he could have heard the wonderful tributes that have been paid to him on the floor of the House. Unlike so many occasions where mellowness sometimes prevails, I am convinced that today there has not been uttered one single expression of exaggeration about this great man. I believe that everything that has been said of him today has come from hearts full of sincerity. What has been said here today can truly serve as a great lesson to younger men. I have felt very keenly as I sat here listening for 2 hours to these wonderful talks about KARL STEFAN—how fine it is that some men live lives which set examples for others, for it is such a life as Karl's that gives the example for younger men to emulate. It answers the question—is it worth while to cling to fine ideals? Is it worth the price we must pay to live lives of morality based on high principles and fine religious concepts? Today, we have here the answer. Unquestionably, it is. Not only have I gained a lesson from what has been said here today, but I have learned a great lesson as I served with Karl on the subcommittee for these many months. One lesson I learned from him, which is so important, and I hope I shall never forget this lesson, as I watched him interrogate witnesses day after day down in that small room beneath the dome of the Capitol, I concluded that truly here is a man who has learned to keep within bounds the passion of expression.

How prone we are to speak with carelessness and do harm with a tongue that can never be healed.

KARL STEFAN taught me that it was greater to keep within proper bounds the passion of expression. I shall always be grateful to him for this valuable lesson that I learned through service with him.

I shall not prolong the hour. Surely I can add nothing to what has been said. In closing, I would only call to your attention the fact that death is no respecter of persons. We know not when it shall strike again, but it does behoove us all to live as KARL STEFAN lived, so that when death strikes we shall be prepared to die as Karl was prepared to die. For truly, when the Angel of Death brushed his black wings against the eyes of KARL STEFAN, it took from our midst one of the great men of all ages who have served in the halls of Congress.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my last sad tribute of respect to my beloved friend and colleague, KARL STEFAN. He was a great soul. Of him it may be truly said that he walked with his head in the clouds and his feet on the ground.

I had the privilege of serving as a member of the State, Commerce, Justice, and the Federal Judiciary Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee when he was chairman of that subcommittee. He was a great chairman. Karl was an indefatigable worker. He was conscientious, sincere, capable, and courageous. He treated every member of his committee with absolute fairness and was kind and considerate of witnesses.

I stand today, Mr. Speaker, with bowed head, among his great host of friends and admirers, and share the sorrow of his wife and family as he passes on in glory to that land from whence no traveler returns.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE].

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a true American and a real friend of the Middle West. I speak of our colleague, the last KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska, who lapsed into eternal sleep yesterday afternoon. I know of no man who has given more to his country and State than Karl. Others have recorded the many and varied accomplishments of this fine man, but I want to express another side of this public servant that is little known.

KARL STEFAN was the finest friend a newcomer to the halls of Congress could have. Early in my congressional career I found a most sympathetic and helpful person in Karl. He went out of his way to assist those of us who were new and his knowledge gained from long-time service was made freely available to us.

Personally, I owe an everlasting debt of gratitude to our departed friend and colleague. His memory will live forever. It was with deepest regret that I head the news of his death. I was shocked. The people of Nebraska and the United States have lost a fine man and a true American.

I want to join my colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Stefan and the members of the family.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we know that our dear beloved just departed colleague dined with kings and presidents and the great, and he dined with the humble and the poor, and he never lost the common touch. And I could fill a book with the deeds and talents and accomplishments of this noble gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when Gen. Douglas MacArthur spoke to the Congress. KARL STEFAN and I were sitting in the double seats just beyond the table there. After Gen. Douglas MacArthur finished speaking Karl said to me: "Is not it the greatest speech you have ever heard? Was it not a wonderful tribute to his fighting men?" And then he turned and said: "Edith, you are crying"; and I said: "Karl, so are you; you have tears in your eyes." Little did he realize that today Members would be crying inwardly if not outwardly over his passing, the passing of a great American, crying because of our loss, but rejoicing because of his life, the glory of his life, the Christianity in his life, his courage and sympathy for all in distress. I believe he had a happy life, but he had sadness in his life because of what had happened to the land where he was born, Bohemia. We had many talks about Bohemia and Bohemians and their desire for freedom, and his anxiety to have them free. He asked me many, many times if I could suggest anything to help.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the words of love and admiration that have been spoken today will be broadcast to Bohemia and to the nations of the world behind the iron curtain. He was greatly interested in having a broadcast go out to tell the people in the world what we in America stand for. His life and how he fought from the time he was a child to improve not only himself but also his country; think what a life, what an example it is. If every school in the country could have the history of KARL STEFAN's life, think what it would mean particularly to those just coming to our country from abroad, those growing up of foreign strains.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not speak of KARL STEFAN's great interest in our veterans. It was, I might say, one of the patterns of his life to see that they were cared for properly. Also, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not speak of what KARL STEFAN did to help us. I am afraid many of us do not listen when people ask our advice, do not listen when they ask us to take up and vote for measures of vital interest to them and which they consider of vital interest for the country. KARL STEFAN in his great kindness and wisdom always listened and always helped whenever he could.

And think, Mr. Speaker, what a happy united couple he and his wife, Ida, were; what a united family was KARL STEFAN's, how they worked together as a family should, not for themselves but for their country. Our warmest sympathy goes

to them in their bereavement. We all have lost a great friend.

KARL STEFAN, Mr. Speaker, has not died; he lives on in our minds and hearts and in the history of America.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I in tender tribute to KARL STEFAN.

The Stefans came in contact with this House when we did, at the beginning of the Seventy-fourth Congress; and from that moment forward he has been a stirring example of what an American in public office should be. Throughout the years it has been my privilege to work with him here; to know him on the city streets; to walk with him down the lanes of Europe; to know him as he worked on the Appropriations Committee; to question him when I needed help. Always there was in him quiet courage, high principle, and conviction. I cannot bear to think that he is gone. There seems so little that one can say about a wife like Ida Stefan. But I could not speak at a moment like this without once again reiterating my own faith that there is no death and that nothing of the good, nor of the greatness, nor of the strength, nor of the power, the spiritual force, that was brought forth in KARL STEFAN, could ever be taken from her or the country that he served.

When I arrived here very new in January, KARL STEFAN came over and sat down by my side and said: "Now, you know, I do not want to offer a lot of advice, but I would like to say to you that if ever you need anything just remember that I am here."

I rather think that that was the way KARL STEFAN walked through all of his life, that not only his friends but strangers whom he touched knew that if they were in need he would be there to help.

Then he pointed out to me that wonderful saying above the rostrum:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all of its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

His own memorable performance will stand as a perpetual monument to KARL STEFAN. What he gave to his family, to his friends, and to his country can never be measured nor questioned, nor can it ever die. I am proud to call myself his friend and there is no one who will be able in all the paths in which he walked to fill his place.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, these days seem to come so very often. It was less than a month ago that I was standing in the well of the House speaking about a colleague from my own State. Now I have lost another friend.

KARL STEFAN came from the heart of old Europe and went to live in the heart of the new America. He certainly was completely American. There was nothing hyphenated about his Americanism, but he did bring from the Old World a

comprehension, an understanding, and a knowledge which was valuable to us and which admirably illustrates, I think, the capacity which many have shown to make the transition from a home in the Old World to a home in the new.

I think there is a great deal of wisdom in the suggestion made by the gentleman from Massachusetts that the tributes to KARL STEFAN should be made known to those who are still living in his old country. Many of you here were thrown into more intimate contact with KARL STEFAN than was I, but I always felt very strongly that whenever an appropriation bill was before the House I depended and relied necessarily on the members of the Appropriations Committee that had studied and handled that particular bill. Whenever that bill was a bill which came from KARL STEFAN's subcommittee I had an added confidence in my own judgment if it rested upon his, because he was a faithful, careful, prudent man, a conscientious and devoted legislator. To his qualities as a legislator he added the human attributes of a singularly sweet and gentle nature.

Somehow the music of Smetana's *Moldau* will always make me think of the man who came from that country to this and gave such fine service in this body.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SITTLER].

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, I speak from the further reaches of the overflow of KARL STEFAN's personality, to testify to the influence of a few of his many unremembered acts of friendship, for I am but a freshman in this House, and he was kind to me.

I did not know him intimately as have many who have spoken here today, but to the extent and for the brief time that I did know him he influenced me tremendously. The constant association with his memory will make me a better Member of this House. I therefore could not refrain from saying so at this solemn hour.

In my district there are many citizens whose roots of family and tradition are set in Bohemia, and whose love of America is like Karl's. They are intensely proud of the achievement that he made as one of their fellows. They are a great people, and they are proud of him. In their behalf, I express sympathy to his family, and offer to them and to us all this thought so well expressed by a poet whose name I do not now recall:

WHEN LIFE SEEMS ENDED ALL TOO SOON
Life held you fast,
And how you loved it, too!
You loved to touch and see and smell the
things of earth;
But came a day, when life with wistful fingers,
beckoned you away.
You did not halt, nor fear nor fall,
But straightway answered that strange lead
into a land so beautiful, so new,
That could we call you back with one quick
word,
We would keep silent,
Yours is the gain, and ours the blessing too.
The world of things unfelt, unseen, unheard,
Is strangely friendly now,
Because you walk where we have never trod,
And sing the songs, the melodies of God.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, the late KARL STEFAN was a kindly man, willing to go out of his way to be helpful to a colleague or friend. I recall that my first meeting with him was on my visit to his office around 7 years ago, when I was working on an article concerning the Indian reservations. His greeting to me was "I shall be glad to help you in any way." As a result of his helpfulness, I visited an Indian reservation in his district, and obtained much valuable information.

Since coming to this body as a new Member last January, I took occasion to ask his suggestions and advice on several occasions. It will be remembered by my colleagues here that some weeks ago, on the occasion of consideration of the appropriation for the State Department, Mr. STEFAN made a most eloquent and thoughtful speech concerning the history and work of this Department, with statesmanlike suggestions as to the improvement of its functioning at home and abroad. Particularly was he interested in bringing all the activities of our Government in foreign lands under the supervision of the State Department. I joined with many Members of this House in congratulating him on this masterful address, and he thanked me heartily.

At the Japanese Peace Treaty conference in San Francisco recently, Mr. STEFAN was a most attentive member of the official delegation. At one of the recess periods during the conference, I again mentioned to him the effectiveness of his speech concerning the State Department, and told him that I would like to get from him some additional material to go into a study of the question of the functioning of the State Department which I am making. Again I heard his cheery words, "I shall be glad to help you in any way."

I join my colleagues of the House in this tribute to a great American, a great statesman, who has now been called to his reward. I shall always remember him as I knew him before I became a Member of this body and since, as a man who wanted always to be helpful to his fellow men.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, an intimate friend of Mr. STEFAN and a native of Nebraska, Mr. Sam Davenport, who is now employed by the House, has written a brief eulogy, which I ask unanimous consent be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

KARL STEFAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 1884-1951
KARL STEFAN lived 67 years?

He would have lived 67 years if he had been an ordinary man.

But KARL STEFAN was not an ordinary man. Born in Bohemia, he saw the land of his birth win freedom from Austrian slavery, live for a brief span as an independent republic, only to pass under the yoke of Communist serfdom.

As a member of the Philippine Constabulary, he saw the brave followers of Jose Rizal—lately liberated from Spanish servitude—prove their right to liberty under

American guidance, and emerge as the free Republic of the Philippines.

As a Nebraskan, he saw his State grow from infant sovereignty into a solvent, prosperous and necessary component of the United States of America.

As an American, he served his people in Congress. He served no other people. He sought, as a Member of the House Committee on Appropriations, to save money for Americans. With the Constitution as his guide, he strove to hold in check the cost of Government so that the Nation's debt might not weigh down the least of his countrymen.

He loved the United States. His words and deeds are admired by all true Americans. He loved Nebraska. All true Nebraskans revere his memory. He loved his friends. There is a niche in their hearts which none other may fill. He loved his wife, his daughter, his son. They love him.

A great man has gone to meet his God.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 444).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. KARL STEFAN, a Representative from the State of Nebraska.

Resolved, That a committee of 11 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee on the part of the House Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska, Mr. CLEVINGER, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. PRESTON, Mr. SMITH of Kansas, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. WERDEL, and Mr. BUFFETT.

The Clerk will report the further resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 4, 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

846. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to create a board of accountability for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved February 17, 1923"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

847. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by

certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 340. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1952; without amendment (Rept. No. 1091). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. NORRELL: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 341. Joint resolution making appropriations for rehabilitation of flood-stricken areas for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1092). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report pursuant to House Resolution 116, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate actual and contemplated action affecting production or consumption of newsprint, or affecting certain other matters (Rept. No. 1093). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5573. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 and to abolish the Appeal Board of the Office of Contract Settlement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 5574. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended by the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, to provide for the release from active duty of certain inactive and volunteer reservists; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 5575. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans for the construction of newsprint plants; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 5576. A bill relating to the spending and quarterly payment of appropriations for the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. R. 5577. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Inc., of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Con. Res. 166. Concurrent resolution setting aside the Charter of the United Nations as approved by the Senate under alleged treaty powers, which approval was unconstitutional and void; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5578. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 5579. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Christ Lagos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 5580. A bill for the relief of Berta Gomes Leite; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

H. R. 5581. A bill for the relief of Yusuf (Uash) Lazar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5582. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wong Ah May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5583. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Latif Assad Hid (also known as Latify Shaker and Latify Mtanous); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 5584. A bill for the relief of Iris Eskinazi Kabbani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5585. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn Elizabeth Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5586. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn Elizabeth Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5587. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn Elizabeth Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5588. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn Elizabeth Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5589. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn Elizabeth Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 5590. A bill for the relief of Marc Stefen Alexenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 5591. A bill for the relief of Sister Angelantonia Diana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENWOOD:

H. R. 5592. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nathalie Iiline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, October 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. George A. Taylor, rector, St. David's Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, ruler of men and nations, we invoke Thy blessing this day upon the United States of America. Enable us to keep intact the priceless liberties and freedoms that have been our heritage from the beginning.

Sustain and guide the Members of this body, the United States Senate. Give them wisdom and strength to uphold good government. Support those who strive to do their duty in the best interests of our country and of their constituents; and in these arduous days let them not be taxed beyond the bounds of their physical strength and endurance.

Upon the entire free world let Thy favor rest, we pray Thee. May we be drawn closer together by Thy holy spirit, that we may reveal to the world the divine intention of peace and good

will among men, and the might and power of Thy strong right arm.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 3, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 3, 1951, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2006) to increase the lending authority of Export-Import Bank of Washington and to extend the period within which the bank may make loans.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4496) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 32, 33, 36, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 52, 53, and 54, to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 990. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of Preston L. Watson, as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased; and

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Nison Miller.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3205. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 3 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service-connected; and

H. R. 5102. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval and Marine Corps installations and defense production plants in such area.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 111) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.